

# Planning Committee

Tuesday, 17th June, 2025

## HYBRID MEETING OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE

Members present: Councillor Murphy (Chairperson);  
Aldermen Lawlor, McCullough and Rodgers;  
Councillors Abernethy, Anglin, Bell, Brennan,  
T. Brooks, Carson, Doran, D. Douglas, S. Douglas,  
Garrett, Groogan, Hanvey, Magee,  
McCabe and McCann.

Also in attendance: Councillors Collins and McKay.

In attendance: Ms. K. Bentley, Director of Planning and Building Control;  
Mr. K. McDonnell, Solicitor (Regulatory and Planning);  
Mr. E. Baker, Planning Manager (Development  
Management),  
Ms. C. Reville, Principal Planning Officer;  
Ms. L. Walshe, Principal Planning Officer;  
Mr. P. O'Reilly, Senior Planning Officer;  
Mr. M. McErlean, Senior Planning Officer; and  
Ms. C. Donnelly, Committee Services Officer.

### Apologies

An apology for inability to attend was reported for Councillor Whyte.

### Minutes

The minutes of the meeting of 13th May were taken as read and signed as correct. It was reported that those minutes had been adopted by the Council at its meeting on 2nd June.

### Declarations of Interest

Alderman Rodgers declared an interest in respect of item 10c on the agenda – “LA04/2024/0211/F - Redevelopment of the existing stadium by way of demolition of both existing stands and construction of two new spectator stands with reconfiguration of existing standing terracing at goal ends, new turnstiles and associated siteworks including new floodlighting, additional car parking and improved circulation routes to provide an overall capacity for 6000 spectators on site. - Existing Football Stadium, The Oval, Parkgate Drive” in that he was a Director of Glentoran Football Club.

Councillor Carson declared an interest in relation to item 8c on the agenda - LA04/2023/2890/F - Proposed demolition of existing buildings and erection of a housing development comprising of 43No. social housing units including dwellings and apartments (Cat 1), car parking, landscaping including an equipped children's play area, and all associated site and access works - Christ the Redeemer Parish Hall and lands

immediately north and west of Christ the Redeemer Church, Lagmore Drive - Use of Financial Developer Contribution, in that he had previously engaged with one of the prospective recipients.

Councillor Groogan declared an interest in relation to item 10m on the agenda - LA04/2024/1036/F - Lagan Gateway Phase 2 - Proposed greenway connection extending between Lagan Gateway Phase 1 at Annadale Embankment to Belvoir Forest Park. Comprising compacted gravel paths; a new elevated (4-5 meter high) timber boardwalk (approximately 85m long); landscaping works, new cycle stands, bollards, seats and bins; and all associated works - Lands to the east of the River Lagan located between Lagan Gateway Phase 1 and Belvoir Park Forest, running adjacent to the west of Belvoir Park Golf Club and approximately 120 metres to the east of Newtownbreda Water Treatment Plant, Galwally Ave, in that she had commented on the proposal at various stages of the application process.

### **Withdrawn Items**

The Committee noted that the undernoted items had been withdrawn from the agenda:

- LA04/2022/1819/F - Demolition of existing buildings and erection of 32 apartments in 3No. blocks (7@ 1no. bedroom & 25@ 2no. bedrooms) (6no. wheelchair adaptable) and associated site works - 39 Upper Dunmurry Lane; and
- LA04/2025/0242/F - Erection of hotel (164 beds) including ground floor bar / restaurant; proposed heights of 8 storeys (c.26.8m to parapet) at Donegall Pass, reducing to 5 storeys at Botanic Avenue and 4 storeys at Ratcliffe Street; and associated works including demolition of existing building - 2 - 10 Botanic Avenue.

### **Deferred Items**

The Committee agreed to defer considerations of the following items in order that site visits be undertaken to the application sites:

- LA04/2024/1654/F - Change of use from a 7-bedroom dwelling house (C1) to a 7 bed/ 9 person House of Multiple Occupancy (Sui Generis) - 432 Falls Road;
- LA04/2024/1865/O - 3no. detached dwellings part 2 storey part 3 storey (amended plans) - Land between No 22 Squires View and Nos 57 & 59 Squires Hill Road; and
- LA04/2025/0122/F - Demolition of 4 no garages and erection of 2 no. semi-detached dwellings, part 2 storey part 3 storey (amended description) (additional plans) - Lands Between 14 and 16 Lancedean Road.

### **Committee Site Visits**

#### **Note of Committee Site Visits**

The Committee noted the site visits.

#### **Schedule of Committee Site Visits**

The Committee agreed to the schedule of site visits from June to December, 2025.

#### **Pre-emptive Committee Site Visits**

The Committee agreed to undertake site visits to the following applications sites:

- LA04/2024/0569/F - Outline planning permission with all matter reserved for independent living (Use Class C3) units and up to 62no. assisted living units (Use Class C1), associated internal access roads, communal open space, revised access from Castlevue Road, associated car parking, servicing, amenity space and landscaping (amended description and plans). - Stormont hotel, 587 Upper Newtownards Road;
- LA04/2024/0570/F - Change of use of from hotel, conference centre and offices (sui generis) to a 97-bed care home (Use Class C3(b) and 1,559sqm diagnostic medical facility (Use Class D1(a), associated access, car parking, landscaping and open space. - Stormont Hotel, 587 Upper Newtownards Road BT4 3LP and adjacent properties at Castlevue Road (nos. 2, 4, 6, 16, 18, 20, 22, 24, 26, 28 & 30), Summerhill Parade (nos. 18, 20 & 22), and Summerhill Park (nos. 37 & 39); and
- LA04/2025/0288/F - Change of use from taxi passenger terminal, cafe, office and newsagent to a Homeless Day Centre, Category D1(B). The centre will provide meals, washing and changing facilities and an internal social amenity area for users. The centre will operate Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday each week from 4:00 pm up until 10:00 pm (Amended Description) - Existing taxi passenger terminal and former retail unit located within 35a King Street.

### **Notification of Vesting Order**

#### **Lands at Woodbourne Crescent**

The Committee noted the Notice of Intention to make a Vesting Order in relation to lands at Woodbourne Crescent.

### **Planning Appeals Notified**

The Committee noted the appeals decisions.

### **Planning Decisions Issued**

The Committee noted the planning decisions issued in May, 2025.

### **Live Applications for Major Development**

The Committee noted the list of live applications for major development.

### **Committee Decisions that have yet to issue**

The Committee noted the list of Committee decisions which had not yet been issued.

### **Miscellaneous Reports**

#### **LA04/2023/4194/F - 2 Storey side and rear extension with single storey flat floor flat roof extension to rear and additional site works. – 2 Lead Hill Park, Belfast, BT6 9RW.**

The Director of Planning and Building Control explained that the application had previously been determined under delegated authority and that, whilst a Member had contacted the Planning Service in order to request that the application be referred to the Planning Committee to determine on the grounds that the application “*would have a negative impact on street scene or on the amenity and privacy of neighbouring properties*”, the request had not been confirmed with the Member and the application had proceeded to determination under delegated authority on 31st March, 2025.

She pointed out that the Member’s request had been made out of time and that the matters raised were considered to have been addressed within the delegated report and conditions attached to the permission. She added that any request by a Member to refer a delegated decision to the Committee was to be considered by the Strategic Director of Planning and Place who would determine whether the reasons given were material planning considerations and of sufficient importance for consideration by the Committee, and did not, therefore, automatically mean that an application was referred to the Committee.

She reported that, in respect of application LA04/2023/4194/F, the issues which had been raised by the Member would have been material, however, the importance of the issues raised might not have warranted consideration by the Committee.

She stated that, given that the request to have the application referred to the Committee was neither confirmed nor refused, the Committee should consider the following three courses of action:

- 1. Members may consider that the decision taken under delegated authority is appropriate as all material considerations and representations to the application were considered before the decision was made. This decision would require no further action from the Council and the planning permission would remain;*

2. *Members may consider that they may have determined the application differently if it had come before Committee. A decision could therefore be made to revoke the permission under S.68 of the Planning Act (NI) 2011. The Council would have to serve Notice on the land owner affected and they would have the opportunity to oppose the revocation. If they choose to oppose the revocation, then a hearing will be scheduled before the Planning Appeals Commission and there are costs implications for the Council and no guarantee that the Order will be granted; or*
3. *Members may consider that the Council has not followed its own procedures and that they may have determined the application differently if it had come before Committee. A decision could therefore be made to apply to the High Court for Judicial Review seeking an order to quash the permission and return the application to the Council for fresh consideration. The Council would have to serve Notice on the applicant affected of the Council's intention to seek to quash the permission and they may seek to challenge the Council's application which would result in a hearing before the Judicial Review Court. There are costs implications and no guarantee that an Order quashing the permission would be granted.*

The Director of Planning and Building Control advised the Committee that, on foot of the missed request, officers had been considering how to ensure that the process for doing so was robust and were currently revising the internal procedures for Members to have an application referred to the Planning Committee for determination.

The Principal Planning Officer summarised the Case Officer's report for the Committee and she highlighted the side and front elevations that included an enclosed privacy wall and obscured glazed and non-opening windows which had been secured by conditions and would protect views.

She stated that the application had been approved under delegated authority, subject to conditions, as it had been considered that the proposal had met the prevailing policies.

### **Proposal**

Moved by Alderman Lawlor,  
Seconded by Councillor Doran,

"That the Committee revokes the permission under S.68 of the Planning Act (NI) 2011."

### **Amendment**

Moved by Councillor Garrett,  
Seconded by Councillor McCabe,

"That the Committee is satisfied with the assessment of the application and the issuing of the permission, and that no further action is required."

On a vote, thirteen Members voted for the amendment and six against and it was declared carried, the amendment was thereupon put to the Committee as the substantive motion and passed.

### **Pre-Determination Hearings - Verbal Report**

The Planning Manager reported that the legislative requirement for councils to hold a mandatory Pre-Determination Hearing (PDH) for certain applications were expected to be removed over the summer, however, as it currently stood, the legislation required the Council to hold a PDH for planning application LA04/2024/0626/F, which sought planning permission for 104 apartments at the site of the former Havelock House, Ormeau Road, where it withdraws its holding direction and returns the application to the Council to determine.

He explained that the application was first approved by the Committee in December 2024, and again in March 2025, however, the Department for Infrastructure (DfI) subsequently issued a holding direction to the Council under Article 17 of the Planning (General Development Procedure) Order (Northern Ireland) 2015, which stated that the Council may not grant planning permission until further advised in writing by the Department

He stated that the Planning Service subsequently wrote to DfI to express significant concern with regard to the rationale for the holding direction having been issued and requested that the matter be expedited. He added that further information which had been requested by DfI had been provided promptly, and that the Department had indicated that it hoped to finalise its position on the holding direction in the upcoming weeks.

He explained that the Council was required to hold a PDH on DfI's withdrawal of its holding direction, however, if the applicable legislation changed before this time, that might no longer be the case, depending on the nature of the legislative changes.

The Committee agreed to hold a mandatory pre-determination hearing for Planning application LA04/2024/0626/F Havelock House, Ormeau Road, if required, and noted that legislative changes due to be made over the summer might remove this requirement.

(Councillor Carson left the room while the following item was under consideration.)

**LA04/2023/2890/F - Proposed demolition of existing buildings and erection of a housing development comprising of 43No. social housing units including dwellings and apartments (Cat 1), car parking, landscaping including an equipped children's play area, and all associated site and access works - Christ the Redeemer Parish Hall and lands immediately north and west of Christ the Redeemer Church, Lagmore Drive, Dunmurry, BT17 0TG. - Use of Financial Developer Contribution**

The Planning Manager explained that, at its meeting in March, the Committee had resolved to grant planning permission for 43 social housing units on lands on and

adjacent to Christ the Redeemer Parish Hall, Lagmore Drive, Dunmurry, subject to conditions and a Section 76 planning agreement.

He stated that the Section 76 planning agreement was required to secure the following:

- 100% social housing;
- Open space management;
- Green travel measures; and
- Financial developer contribution which should be used to mitigate the impacts of the development and shall be flexible in terms of how it was used to mitigate the loss of community facility and/or loss of open space.

He explained that the Committee had delegated authority to the Director of Planning and Building Control to finalise the Section 76 planning agreement and the use of the financial developer contribution of £27,140 to mitigate either the loss of open space and/or loss of community facility as a result of the development, and that the Developer Contribution had been paid to the Council subsequent to the planning permission having been issued.

He pointed out that, in considering the application, the Committee had concern with regard to the loss of the Parish Hall as a community facility, having had regard to Policy C11, that related to the protection of community infrastructure.

He stated that the Parish Hall had previously been occupied by the Girl Guides and Little Saints Out of School Club, after-school and holiday club and that, since the application was before the Committee, the Girl Guides had made alternative accommodation arrangements.

He reported that officers had been engaging with Little Saints Out of School Club and the Church with regard to the potential use of the Developer Contribution to help finance a mobile unit within the Church grounds, which Little Saints Out of School Club would then occupy. He added that the out of school club had temporarily relocated to a location approximately two miles from its previous location and was keen to return to the locality to serve locally and improve child capacity.

The Planning Manager advised the Committee that using the Developer Contribution towards a mobile unit for the out of school club would be complicated as it would only constitute part funding, with the remainder owned by the occupier, which was a private business. He summarised further foreseen complications that would result from the occupier ceasing business or relocating. He clarified that there was nothing in principle to preclude Developer Contributions being allocated to private businesses.

He informed the Committee that, in discussions with a Member about the potential use of the Developer Contribution, it was suggested that it could be used to help fund a new permanent building for the Lagmore Youth Project which was currently based in temporary marquee accommodation within the grounds of the Church and was seeking a permanent building in the locale.

He stated that there was an undetermined planning application for the new building, with an expected completion within three years and an estimated cost of £250k with £40k already secured and the remainder of the funding expected from various other sources.

He informed the Committee that, since publication of the report, representation had been received from Little Saints Out of School Club that included the following points:

- The Club was vital for families in the Colin Community, providing safe and structured before and after school care and holiday care (open all year around);
- The Club offered activities for children; support for working parents; enhanced learning opportunities; parental flexibility; structured learning; improved outcomes for disadvantaged children, community support;
- The Parish Hall was used by many local groups over the years and was a great loss to the community. The only halls available to community groups in Lagmore were Lagmore Youth Project Hall and Lagmore Forum Hall, but they had no room to facilitate these groups;
- The two groups that used the Parish Hall were the Out of School Club and Girl Guides;
- The Out of School Club was temporarily sharing a building with another after school club and needed to leave in one year; the Girl Guides were temporarily in a school for one night a week;
- The Out of School Club proposed to put a mobile unit in the church grounds. The cost of the project was £97k, privately financed together with the £27k Developer Contribution. The mobile unit would be available for other community uses in the mornings, weekends and 3 other evenings. The Out of School Club had been approached by other groups about sharing the mobile unit; and
- The Club wished that the Developer Contribution would be used towards the mobile unit and, without that support, the Club stated that it could not move forward and these services would be lost to the community.

He reported late correspondence which had also been received via Little Saints Out of School Club from the Girl Guides which had raised concern that the Developer Contribution might not be allocated for use by multiple community groups as it had understood that there would be community discussions regarding the allocation of the monies and that many local groups could be involved for the benefit of the whole community. He added that Simply Judo had submitted correspondence which indicated that it would be interested to share the proposed mobile unit facilities if there was space to operate community classes.

The Planning Manager stated that, having regard to the assessment of the issues, it was recommended that the £27k Developer Contribution would be used to support the funding of a new permanent building for the Lagmore Youth Project and that appropriate provision would be required for return of the monies to the Council, should it not be committed or spent within a specified timeframe.

The Committee agreed to hear from Councillor Collins who attended the meeting in respect of the application.



Councillor Collins informed the Committee that the Lagmore Community Forum had flagged up concerns that it was not consulted in how the Developer Contribution could potentially be distributed and stated that he felt the Planning Service should have consulted the forum whilst exploring how the monies would be allocated and that the consultation process had not been thorough enough. He also raised concern in relation to Councillor Duffy, who had made the suggestion to the Planning Service that Lagmore Youth Project should be considered as a recipient of the Developer Contribution, as he was a Board Member of Lagmore Youth Project and stated that it was a conflict of interest for Councillor Duffy having done so.

The Chairperson informed Councillor Collins that Councillor Duffy was not a Member of the Planning Committee and that the Council had delegated authority to the Committee to make the decision and that, therefore, there had been no conflict of interest.

The Chairperson welcomed Ms. M. McCann, Manager, Little Saints Out of School Club, to the meeting.

Ms. McCann stated that she was given a few months in January, 2024 to vacate Lagmore Parish Hall and that she had been in contact with the Planning Service and others and was told that she would be offered a contribution towards placing a mobile unit in the Church grounds.

She stated that a vital service had been lost within the community and that, without the offer from Killeaton Orange Hall, the business would have closed and jobs would have been lost.

She stated that Little Saints Out of School Club had been told the previous week that the full Developer Contribution was being allocated to Lagmore Youth Project and that, whilst it was an important community group, there were other vital community services in need of the funding. She asked the Committee to defer consideration of the report until further community consultation could be undertaken.

In response to a question from a Member as to whether the applicant had any view or authority as to how the Developer Contribution would be allocated, the Planning Manager explained that the decision was to be taken by the Committee and that there had been no input from the applicant.

A number of Members indicated that they would be minded to defer consideration in order to determine whether alternative allocation of funds could be explored, whereby the Developer Contributions would be split between organisations or whether Lagmore Youth Project would be willing to permit the use of the proposed permanent building to other local organisations.

The Director of Planning and Building Control stated that she appreciated the concern from the Committee with regard to the decision, that the situation was unusual and that, going forward, it would be the responsibility of the applicant to engage and consult with communities and to indicate where the Developer Contributions would be allocated within the Section 76 planning agreement, before determination, so that the situation would not arise in the future.

**Proposal**

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

“That the Committee defers consideration of the application in order to engage with the local community and determine the most feasible use of the monies.”

**Amendment**

Moved by Councillor McCann,  
Seconded by Councillor Brennan,

“That the Committee agrees to allocate the developer contribution of £27,140 towards the funding of a permanent building for the Lagmore Youth Project, located within the grounds of Christ the Redeemer Church.”

On a vote, thirteen Members voted for the amendment and five against and it was declared carried. The amendment was thereupon put to the Committee as the substantive motion and passed.

**Local Applications subject to NI Water Objections**

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

(Councillor Carson returned to the meeting.)

**Planning Applications previously considered**

**LA04/2022/1046/F - Proposed demolition of existing building and construction of a residential development consisting of 14 No. units (9 No. apartments within a three storey building and 5 No. two storey terraced dwellings) with associated landscaping and car parking (amended description). - 18 Annadale Avenue**

At the request of Councillor Brennan, the Committee agreed to defer consideration of the application to allow more time to consider the restricted viability information.

**LA04/2024/1466/F - Ground floor extension and alterations to provide 1 No. retail unit. Two storey rear extension. Rear dormer. Change of use of first & second floor level & part of ground floor level to 6 bed / 6 person HMO (amended description and plans). - 41 Rosetta Road**

At the request of Councillor Groogan, the Committee agreed to defer consideration of the application and to request that DfI attend a future meeting of the Committee to answer questions with regards to its consultation response.

(Councillor Hanvey left the meeting whilst the undernoted application was being considered.)

**LA04/2024/1584/F - Subdivision of 6No. bed shared dwelling to provide 3No. self contained flats, with demolition of single storey rear return and erection of two storey rear extension to provide 1no self contained flat. - 21 Skegoneill Avenue**

The Senior Planning Officer summarised the application for the Committee and highlighted the following key points for consideration:

- Four third party objections had been received and were addressed in the case officer report;
- No objections had been received from consultees;
- There was sufficient provision for bin storage whilst retaining sufficient amenity space;
- The application met internal spaces standards as per the Belfast LDP; and
- No impact on the Glandore Gardens Area of Townscape Character.

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

The Chairperson welcomed Ms. A. M. McGarrity and Ms. J. McCaughey from MindWise and Ms. G. Donnelly, Choice Housing, to the meeting.

Ms. McCaughey explained that the site had been a supported living service for a number of years with a number of clients being supported with regards to their mental health by MindWise.

She stated that the proposal would not change the number of clients that would be supported but would enhance the support provided, therefore, there would be no impact with regard to additional parking in the area and support would continue.

Ms. Donnelly stated that she had been with Choice Housing for around 18 years, managing Skegoniel for the majority of that time and explained that it operated very well as a supported living service in north Belfast where there was huge unmet demand for mental health services.

She stated the residents had severe enduring mental illness and that the accommodation was not conducive to a therapeutic environment to provide recovery or management of those service users or the support services that they availed of, and that it was necessary to create an environment which supported the residents.

She stated that she had never received any complaints from the local community with regard to the property or residents.

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

(Councillor Hanvey returned to the meeting.)

**LA04/2024/0267/F - Change of Use from  
Dwelling to 6no bed/6person HMO  
(amended description) - 11 Friendly Way**

The Senior Planning Officer outlined the application to the Committee and highlighted that the scheme was compliant with Policy HOU10 in that the 10% threshold for Houses of Multiple Occupation (HMO) on Friendly Way had not yet been reached.

He stated that officers considered that the scheme would not be harmful in terms of impact upon traffic and parking or residential amenity.

He informed the Committee that 290 objections had been received which had raised issues with regard to impact on amenity, parking and waste storage.

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

The Chairperson welcomed Councillor McKay to the meeting.

Councillor McKay highlighted that the reason the application was before the Committee was because of significant local opposition to the proposal.

He stated that the Local Development Plan provided for the retention and cultivation of social communities and that he believed that the application was contrary to this. He stated that the property had been a family home and would be converted and split up for single people staying in rooms when there were families in the community who had been waiting up to ten years for three-bedroom houses to become available.

He explained that the proposal did not fit the community that live there and was completely against the character of the Markets area. He stated that it was important for communities to have a say on their areas and, in the Markets area, families were struggling to remain in the area and he urged to Committee to take account of those views.

The Committee agreed to hear from Mr. D. Worthington, Pragma Planning, and Mr. F. Hargey, Market Development Association, who had submitted a late request to make representations to the Committee in objection to the application, and the Chairperson welcomed them to the meeting.

Mr. Hargey stated that the Market Development Association was the overarching community group within the Markets area and he explained that the strength of the community's feeling on the issue was demonstrated by the number of letters of objection submitted with the main concern being that such proposals hollow the community from the inside out.

He reported that there were already several similar properties being used as Airbnb's and that, whilst tourism was welcome in the city, it was socially irresponsible tourism comprising of hen and stag parties that were situated beside family homes. He highlighted recent protests in European cities in relation to socially irresponsible tourism.

Mr. Worthington explained that the principle basis of the objection was the LDP strategy, Policy HOU3, which stated that there was a general presumption in favour of retaining residential stock for permanent occupation.

He informed the Committee that the purpose of Policy HOU3 was expressly to protect existing dwellings and that the proposal was in an established residential area and that HMO's were not considered housing and the policy was therefore engaged by the proposal as it was not complementary to the surrounding residential area and would impact on amenity.

He explained that Friendly Way was exclusively family housing which had been designed in an era where car ownership was much lower and so there was already substantial overparking in the street.

He stated that the proposed HMO did not provide a like for like replacement and did not address local need for housing and would be likely to generate adverse effects on existing residential amenity and it was relevant that the noise impact of the application be considered.

A Member requested that further guidance be made available to the Committee to assist with the intensification of parking provision in relation to HMOs in comparison with family homes, when considering similar applications in the future.

A Member asked if the proposal provided sufficient living space in terms of the kitchen, dining and living space combined into one area. The Senior Planning Officer stated that the proposal met the space standards set out in the Local Development Plan.

**Proposal**

Moved by Councillor Brennan,  
Seconded by Councillor Carson, and

Resolved - "That the Committee refuses the application based on Policy HOU3, in order to protect the residential stock in an established residential community and the quality of living accommodation and delegates authority to the Director of Planning and Building Control to finalise the wording of the reasons for refusal."

**LA04/2024/0095/F - Change of use from  
Dwelling to Short term let (retrospective)  
3 Broadway Link**

The Senior Planning Officer summarised the application for the Committee and highlighted the following key areas for consideration:

- Principle of a change of use to short term let at the location;
- Protection of existing residential accommodation;
- Character, design and appearance;
- Impact on amenity; and
- Impact on established residential area.

He stated that the proposal strengthened and diversified the range of short-stay visitor accommodation in the city, was located in close proximity to Windsor Park that would attract visitors from outside the city on a short-term basis.

The explained that a management plan would be secured via condition and that part of the property would be retained as permanent residential use and therefore protected the existing residential stock.

He pointed out that there had been 61 objections to the proposal and two letters of support and that most of the issues raised in objection had been related to carparking, waste and overall security.

He informed the Committee that it was recommended that the application be approved, subject to conditions.

Several Members raised concerns with regard to the property having been already in use as a short-term let property and expressed doubt that there was, and would be, a permanent resident residing within the property, one Member demonstrated at the meeting that the three-bedroom property was available to book online in its entirety.

Another Member, who had been present at a recent Committee site visit to the property, highlighted that there were a number of key lock boxes attached to the outside of the property which further inferred that there was no permanent resident.

The Planning Manager highlighted that there had been a number of Planning Appeals Commission decisions where it had supported the use of conditions in relation to management plans and in terms of the retention of the single bedroom as permanent residential use, however, the Committee could impose a condition to provide that one of the larger bedrooms be retained for permanent residential use.

### **Proposal**

Moved by Alderman Lawlor,  
Seconded by Councillor Doran,

“That the Committee agrees to refuse the application on the grounds of the protection of residential stock and that the type of accommodation was not in keeping with the local community.”

### **Amendment**

Moved by Councillor Garrett,  
Seconded by Councillor Carson, and

Resolved – “That the Committee agrees to defer consideration of the application to allow officers to carry out an assessment on potential reasons for refusal based on the concerns raised by the Committee.”

The amendment was thereupon put to the Committee as the substantive motion and passed.

### **New Planning Applications**

**LA04/2024/1592/F - Residential development comprising the demolition of no. 8 Marlborough Street, partial demolition of existing Marlborough House, and the refurbishment of existing Listed Building (Princes Court) (3 storeys), for the erection of 103 no. apartments (mix of 1-bed, 2-bed and 3 bed units) (8 storeys), with provision of private amenity, and internal and external communal amenity spaces; and associated site and infrastructure works. (amended description) - Marlborough House, (no. 28-32 Victoria Street), and no. 8 Marlborough Street**

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

- Principle of housing in the location;
- Housing density;
- Affordable housing;
- Housing mix;

- Adaptable and accessible accommodation;
- Residential quality and impact on amenity;
- Open space;
- Access and transport;
- Design and placemaking;
- Impact on heritage assets;
- Climate change;
- Health impacts;
- Environmental protection;
- Flood risk and drainage;
- Waste-water infrastructure;
- Waste management;
- Natural heritage;
- Employability and Skills;
- Section 76 planning agreement; and
- Pre-application Community Consultation.

She reported that two third party objections had been received and that DFI Roads, DFC HED, DFI Rivers Agency, Environmental Health, Shared Environmental Services (SES), BCC Urban Design Team and NIEA Natural Environment Division and Regulation Unit had offered no objection to the proposal. She added that Translink had submitted an objection due to potential impacts on the adjacent Laganside Bus Station as well as concerns regarding noise and that, since the publication of the report, it had requested that a final noise impact assessment be resolved during the application process and a meeting with officers.

She stated that officers considered that the final noise impact assessment would be a routine matter dealt with by condition and that the request for a meeting arrived at a very late stage in the application process and that officers were content that the issues raised had been dealt with within the report.

She reported that the applicant had indicated, since publication of the report, that they were willing to explore a Developer Contribution towards playpark facilities and that there was a Section 76 planning agreement which had been agreed to secure 80% social housing, a green travel fund and to ensure that the listed building was priorities in the overall programme of redevelopment to be completed within two years.

She informed the Committee that the proposal would bring a vacant listed building back into use and was compliant with relevant housing and design policies, climate change, transport, flood risk, archaeology and natural heritage policies.

She stated that, having regard to the Development Plan and other material considerations, it was recommended that planning permission be granted, subject to conditions and a Section 76 planning agreement.

The Chairperson welcomed Mr. T. Stokes, TSA Planning, Mr. M. Martin, Applicant, and Mr. G. McCarney, Project Architect, to the meeting.



Mr. Stokes stated that the applicant had shown a strong commitment to investment in the city. He explained that Prince's Court had been vacant since 1992 and had been added to the heritage at risk register in 2023.

He stated that the main public façade of the site was the existing vacant six story office building, Marlborough House, which had been vacant since 2022. He informed the Committee that the office building was no longer fit for purpose which had led to the opportunity to repurpose the building and increase the presence of city centre living.

He stated that the relationship between the proposal and the existing Laganside Bus Centre had been carefully considered whereby the apartments had been designed so as not to prejudice the ongoing operations of the bus centre mindful of the potential aspirations of the bus centre to redevelop.

He requested that the Committee approve the application.

The Committee granted planning permission, subject to conditions and a Section 76 planning agreement, and delegated authority to the Director of Planning and Building Control to finalise the wording of the conditions and Section 76 planning agreement, to include exploring the option of securing a Financial Developer Contribution for the funding of an equipped children's play area, and to deal with any other issues that might arise, provided that they were not substantive.

**LA04/2024/2044/F - Erection of 895 room Purpose Built Managed Student Accommodation (PBMSA) across 9-20 storey building blocks with communal facilities, internal and external communal amenity space including landscaped courtyard and roof terraces and ancillary accommodation. With additional use outside term time (no more than 50% of the rooms) as short-term let accommodation and (no more than 50% of the rooms) accommodation for use by further or higher education institutions - Lands at 39 Corporation Street**

The Principal Planning Officer summarised the application and referred to the following key issues for consideration:

- Principle of PBMSA in the location;
- Design and placemaking;
- Impact on heritage assets;
- Impact on amenity;
- Climate change;
- Open space;
- Access and transport;
- Health impacts;
- Environmental protection;

- Flood risk and drainage;
- Waste-water infrastructure;
- Natural heritage;
- Waste management;
- Section 76 planning agreement; and
- Pre-Application Community Consultation.

She informed the Committee that correspondence had been received since publication of the report from the Hotel Federation of Northern Ireland that expressed concern at the impact of the short-term let nature of the proposal on the hotel industry in Northern Ireland.

She reported that the proposed building was considered to be of high-quality design, appropriate to its location, which would regenerate a site which contained a vacant office building. She added that five letters of support had been received and that student need had been demonstrated and was considered to have met the policy requirement.

She stated that the short-term let component would operate in no more than 50% of the rooms during July and August and only subject to Tourism NI certification.

The Principal Planning Officer reported that DfI Rivers, DfI Roads, Belfast City Airport, Historic Environment Division, DAERA: Water Management Unit and DAERA: Regulation Unit had been consulted and had no objections, subject to conditions and that NI Water objected due to capacity issues which was addressed in the report. She added that final responses from NIEA: Natural Environment Division (NED) and Shared Environmental Services (SES) were awaited.

She stated that it was recommended that planning permission be granted, subject to conditions and a Section 76 planning agreement.

The Chairperson welcomed Mr. T. Stokes, TSA Planning, Mr. A. Parke, LIKE Architects, Mr. B. Lavery, CBRENI, and Mr. S. English, Elkstone, to the meeting.

Mr. Stokes explained that the proposal was an opportunity to redevelop a long-standing underutilised site. He stated that Elkstone was an established operator of purpose-built student accommodation and its developments were market leading with best in class sustainability credentials and provide meaningful and positive social value creation.

He stated that the proposal would generate footfall, active frontages and would support the regeneration of the surrounding area providing an identified need for student accommodation in the city.

He highlighted that the scheme had received letters of support from the Northern Ireland Chamber, Belfast Chamber of Commerce, Retail NI and Hospitality Ulster.

He concluded by stating that the scheme represented a significant investment in the city and would become a beacon for the regeneration of Corporation Street.

A Member enquired as to whether provision was made for those students who required year-round accommodation, Mr. Stokes responded by informing the Committee that 50% of the accommodation would be retained exclusively for student use.

In response to a question from a Member with regard to the proposals potential impact on local tourism, Mr. Lavery stated that the proposal was not considered competitive with the established hotel market in Belfast. He stated that the proposal was targeting an alternative market for backpackers and students as there was a lack of hostel accommodation, and to compete with Airbnb, that was impacting on the current hosing stock in the city.

The Committee agreed to hear from Ms. J. Gault, Director of Northern Ireland Hotels Federation (NIHF), who had submitted a late request to make representation to the Committee.

Ms. Gault informed the Committee that the NIHF had a number of issues with regard to the proposal. She outlined the current levels of student accommodation in the city and questioned the proposed need.

She stated that the NIHF's main objection was the short-term letting of student accommodation during the summer months and felt it didn't compete in a fair way with the general hotel industry.

She informed the Committee that the NIHF had requested engagement during the application process but it hadn't happened and she appealed to the Committee to refuse the application as the scale, size and inability to apply enforcement presented considerable issues for the city's tourism economy.

A Member highlighted that there was a misconception that the Committee approved any application for Purpose Built Managed Student Accommodation (PBMSA) and asked the officers to confirm that the Committee was taking decisions within the threshold of unmet need. The Principal Planning Officer explained that, should all planning permissions which had been granted for PBMSAs be delivered in full, the likely ratio of PBMSA bed spaces to student places would remain broadly comparable to similar university cities.

The Committee granted planning permission, subject to conditions and a Section 76 planning agreement, and delegated authority to the Director of Planning and Building Control to finalise the wording of the conditions and Section 76 planning agreement and to deal with any other issues that arise, including resolving final responses from Environmental Health, NIEA: NED and SES, provided that the issues were not substantive.

(Alderman Rodgers left the meeting whilst the following item was under consideration.)

**LA04/2024/0211/F - Redevelopment of the existing stadium by way of demolition of both existing stands and construction of two new spectator stands with reconfiguration of existing standing terracing at goal ends, new turnstiles and associated siteworks including new floodlighting, additional car parking and improved circulation routes to provide an overall capacity for 6000 spectators on site.**  
**- Existing Football Stadium, The Oval, Parkgate Drive**

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

- Principle of development at the location;
- Design, placemaking and impact on amenity;
- Access and transport;
- Healthy communities;
- Built heritage;
- Natural heritage;
- Climate change;
- Flood risk and drainage;
- Waste-water infrastructure;
- Environmental protection;
- Waste management;
- Employability and skills; and
- Pre-application community consultation.

He reported that there had been no objection in principle from any consultees, subject to conditions, there was no increase in capacity and that the Grandstand and North Stand would be 5 metres and 4 meters lower, respectively, than the existing stands.

The Committee granted planning permission, subject to conditions, and delegated authority to the Director of Planning and Building Control to resolve final consultation responses, finalise the wording of conditions, and to deal with any other matters that might arise provided that they were not substantive.

(Alderman Rodgers returned to the meeting.)

**LA04/2025/0535/F - Variation of conditions 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 11, 14, 17, 18, 19, 36, 37 and 41 of approval LA04/2023/2390/F and LA04/2020/0804/F to facilitate removal of 31 previously approved dwellings and retaining structure along northern boundary of site adjacent to Upper Springfield Road. Retention of existing sloping ground levels and landscaping at this location. - Lands West of Monagh By-Pass South of Upper Springfield Road & 30-34 Upper Springfield Road & West of Aitnamona Crescent & St Theresa's Primary School. North and East of 2-22 Old Brewery Lane, Glanaulin, 137-143a Glen Road & Airfield Heights & St Mary's CBG School**

The Senior Planning Officer summarised the application and referred to the proposed housing density, revised road layout and open space management.

He stated that, having regard to the Local Development Plan and other material considerations, the proposal was considered acceptable.

The Committee approved the application to vary conditions 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 11, 14, 17, 18, 19, 36 and 41 of approval LA04/2023/2390/F and LA04/2020/0804/F and delegated authority to the Director of Planning and Building Control to finalise the wording of the conditions and Section 77 planning agreement, to deal with the outstanding DfI Roads response and any other issues that might arise, provided that they were not substantive.

**LA04/2023/4543/F - Proposed new changing pavilion, enhancing grounds entrances including turnstiles, ancillary facilities and upgrade to existing car park. Proposed 3G surfacing to existing grass pitch with flood lighting - 885 Shore Road**

The Principal Planning Officer outlined the application to the Committee and reported that there had been no representations from third parties. DfI Roads, DfC HED, DfI Rivers Agency had offered no objection to the proposal and NI Water had objected on the grounds of capacity, which had been addressed within the report.

She reported that the NIEA Natural Environment Division Environmental Health, Shared Environmental Services (SES) consultation responses were outstanding and were expected within the upcoming weeks.

She stated that all materials to be used in the pitch were to be biodegradable and that the proposal was compliant with the relevant policies.

She recommended that the application be approved, subject to conditions.

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

**LA04/2024/1761/RM - Application for approval of reserved matters application for a medical facility in accordance with outline planning permission LA04/2020/0845/O, seeking approval of layout, scale, appearance and landscaping details - Land forming Plot 9 of the Kings Hall development as approved by LA04/2020/0845/O**

The Principal Planning Officer summarised the application which sought approval of the following reserved matters for Plot 9:

- Siting;
- Design: including height, scale, massing, form of buildings and floor plans;
- External appearance;
- Means of access; and
- Landscaping.

She stated that the design of the building complied with the approved Design Code and was in keeping with the character and appearance of the area.

She reported that there had been no objections from statutory or non-statutory consultees and that nine objections had been received and all concerns raised had been addressed within the report.

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

The Committee approved the reserved matters, subject to conditions, and delegated authority to the Director of Planning and Building Control to finalise the wording of the conditions and to deal with any issues arising from the outstanding consultee response from DFI Roads, provided that they were not substantive.

**LA04/2025/0399/F - Additional 3 car parking spaces and additional landscaping to serve Plot 4 of Kings Hall development (planning permission ref: LA04/2022/0311/F) - Lands at Plot 4 of Kings Hall Healthcare Village, west of 25 Harberton Park and north of 27 Harberton Crescent**

The Principal Planning Officer outlined the application and stated that the principle of development had been established by the previous planning permission and

only the proposal for the additional car parking spaces was considered in the assessment of the application.

She reported that DfI Roads had offered no objection to the proposal and that there would be no loss of landscaping related to the application.

She stated that, having regard to the Development Plan and other material considerations, the proposal was considered acceptable and it was recommended that the application be approved.

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

(Councillor Groogan retired from the meeting.)

**LA04/2024/1036/F - Lagan Gateway Phase 2**  
**- Proposed greenway connection extending**  
**between Lagan Gateway Phase 1 at**  
**Annadale Embankment to Belvoir Forest**  
**Park. Comprising compacted gravel paths;**  
**a new elevated (4-5 meter high) timber**  
**boardwalk (approximately 85m long);**  
**landscaping works, new cycle stands,**  
**bollards, seats and bins; and all associated**  
**works - Lands to the east of the River**  
**Lagan located between Lagan Gateway**  
**Phase 1 and Belvoir Park Forest, running**  
**adjacent to the west of Belvoir Park Golf**  
**Club and approximately 120 metres to the**  
**east of Newtownbreda Water Treatment**  
**Plant, Galwally Ave, Belfast BT8 7YA**

The Principal Planning Officer provided an overview of the application to the Committee and stated that the site was located outside the development limits and within Lagan Valley Regional Park as designated within the most recent version of draft Belfast Metropolitan Area Plan 2015 (v2004).

She informed the Committee that the proposal was considered acceptable, in principle, in that it was sympathetic to the rural character of the surrounding area and the proposed greenway would improve connectivity in the area and contribute to enhancing the character of the area.

She explained that the proposal was not considered to have significant impacts on the Lagan Valley Regional Park or the area of outstanding beauty designation.

She reported that Shared Environmental Services and the Council's Tree Officer had offered no objection to the proposal and there was one outstanding consultation response from NIEA Natural Environment Division which had requested further information which has since been submitted.

She stated that it was recommended that the application be approved, subject to conditions.

The Committee granted planning permission, subject to conditions, and delegated authority to the Director of Planning and Building Control to finalise the wording of the conditions and resolve the outstanding NIEA consultation response and to deal with any other matters that might arise, provided that they were not substantive.

**Restricted Items**

**Building Control Outstanding Accounts**

The Director of Planning and Building Control requested that the Committee authorise the writing off of outstanding accounts of two companies due to the administration of both.

The Committee agreed to write off the outstanding accounts in accordance with Section M12 of the Council's Financial Regulations.

Chairperson