

## PLANNING COMMITTEE

Tuesday, 12th August, 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, Hanvey, Magee,  
McCabe, McCann and Whyte.

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),  
Mr. D. O’Kane, Acting Planning Manager (Plans and  
Policy)  
Ms. C. Reville, Principal Planning Officer;  
Ms. L. Walshe, Principal Planning Officer;  
Ms. C. Donnelly, Committee Services Officer.

#### **Apologies**

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

#### **Minutes**

The minutes of the meeting of 17th 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, 2025, subject to the omission of those matters in respect of which the Council had delegated its powers to the Committee.

#### **Declarations of Interest**

Cllr Doran declared an interest in respect of item 12d on the agenda - LA04/2024/1865/O - 3no. detached dwellings part 2 storey part 3 storey (amended plans) - Land between No 22 Squires View and Nos 57 and 59 Squires Hill Road, in that his employer had undertaken work with the developer.

#### **Committee Site Visits**

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

The Committee noted the site visits.

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

The Committee agreed to undertake a site visit to the following application sites:

- LA04/2024/2134/F - Mixed use scheme for new community recreational facilities, including basketball court, parkland and residential development comprising 40no social/affordable housing units with landscaping and associated works. - Site of the former Dunmurry Cricket Club, Ashley Park, Dunmurry, Belfast BT17 0QQ, located north of 1-10 Ashley Park and south of 1-20 Areema Grove and Areema Drive; and
- LA04/2024/0948/F and LA04/2024/0955/LBC Derelict lands at and to the rear of numbers 34-36 The Mount, Belfast, BT5 4NA Redevelopment of listed buildings and lands to the rear for a residential development comprising 20no. townhouses and 6no. apartments with associated landscaping, parking and site works.

### **Notification of Provision/Removal of Parking Bays**

The Committee noted the Notice of Removal of Parking Bay in relation to 10 Castlereagh Place.

### **Notification from Statutory Bodies - Stopping Up Order**

The Committee noted the Notice of Proposed Stopping-Up at St. Andrew's Square West.

### **Notifications from Statutory Bodies: Abandonment and Extinguishment**

The Committee noted the Notices of Proposed Abandonment at Glencairn Road, Little Victoria Street, Exchange Street, Wandsworth Road and Maple Hill.

### **Notifications from Statutory Bodies: Experimental Traffic Control Scheme**

### **Waiting Restrictions - Bedford Street**

The Committee noted the Notice of Experimental Traffic Control Scheme (Waiting Restrictions – Bedford Street).

### **Planning Appeals Notified**

The Committee noted the appeals decisions.

### **Planning Decisions Issued**

The Committee noted the planning decisions issued in June and July, 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**

#### **Listing of 174 Upper Malone Road and Gardner Robb Building, City Hospital, 51 Lisburn Road**

The Committee noted and supported the proposed listing of 174 Upper Malone Road and the Gardner Robb Building, City Hospital.

### **Committee Review of Implemented Applications**

The Committee noted the arrangements for site visits to implemented schemes and the procedure for proposing visits to specific schemes.

The Planning Manager (Development Management) invited Elected Members to contact the Planning Service with suggestions for sites to visit and that potential sites would be discussed with the Chair.

### **Local Applications Subject to Objections from NI Water**

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

**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**

The Planning Manager (Development Management) outlined the application to the Committee, upon which consideration had been deferred at its meetings in March, April and June, 2025, and explained that the applicant had provided a viability assessment which demonstrated that the scheme would not remain viable if affordable housing was provided. He reported that the viability assessment had been independently appraised by Naylor Devlin, acting on behalf of the Council, which confirmed that the scheme would be unviable.

He informed the Committee that the applicant had agreed to a viability review mechanism which would reappraise the viability of the scheme prior to commencement of development that would be secured by a Section 76 planning agreement, which had been agreed in principle.

He reported that it was the view of officers that Policy ENV2 was satisfied and that the applicant had demonstrated that it was not feasible to retain the existing building from a viability perspective, and that retention of the original building would restrict access to the rear.

The Planning Manager explained that the applicant had provided viability information regarding different options to retain the existing building which concluded that retention was unviable, and having regard to the independent appraisal which confirmed unviability, demolition was considered acceptable.

He stated that, having regard to the Development Plan and material considerations, it was recommended that planning permission was granted, subject to conditions and the agreed Section 76 planning agreement, to secure a viability review of the scheme, prior to commencement.

The Chairperson welcomed Ms. H. Warner to the meeting, attending in objection to the application.

Ms. Warner explained that she resided in a neighbouring property and had concerns with regard to the potential impact of the proposed development. She stated that the proposal would lead to loss of light, overshadowing and result in the removal of established trees and vegetation to the rear of the site.

The Chairperson welcomed Mr. E. Morgan, Planning Agent, speaking on behalf of the applicant, to the meeting. Mr. Morgan stated that a pre-application discussion had been submitted to the Council in October, 2020 and that the Council had confirmed that the principle of development was acceptable on the site and based on that guidance, the applicant proceeded to purchase the property.

He stated that the appointed design team had explored a range of development options with the initial brief to retain, extend and repurpose the existing building, however, those options proved unviable.

He stated that all options had been independently verified by Naylor Devlin and concluded that retention was not viable, however, the applicants had committed to use sustainability principles by salvaging materials such as red brick and roof tiles for reuse in the proposed development.

He highlighted that the existing building was not listed or located within a conservation area and that a previous planning approval for demolition and redevelopment for 14 apartments was granted in 2009. He pointed out that current regulations would permit demolition without the requirement of planning consent.

He stated that the proposal would reconfigure the site layout to enhance the public realm and outlined the planning history and associated costs. He explained that the retention was not feasible, demonstrated by robust evidence and that the refusal would discourage developers and investors in a time when house building should be encouraged.

In response to a question from a Member with regard to the social housing element of the viability options, the Planning Manager explained that Policy HOU5 permitted case specific assessments where a scheme had not proven viable.

A Member indicated that she was not content with the proposed demolition, despite the building not having been in a conservation area or listed, as it did make a positive contribution of significant character to Annadale Avenue. She referred to the officer's report and pointed out that advice had been sought from DfC HED at the Pre-Application Discussion stage and that HED had stated "*the existing building, Busy Bees, contributes significant character to Annadale Avenue and HED advises that it is a prime candidate for local listing*" and she explained that the existing building's architectural features were of historical value.

She added that the proposed replacement building was significantly larger and did not sit well within the context of the area. She referred to Policy ENV2, stating that proposals should seek to avoid demolition and reuse existing structures as far as possible and that proposal to recycle material would not mitigate the loss of the building in terms of its contribution to the character and appearance of the area.

**Proposal**

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

“That the Committee refuses to grant planning permission on the basis that the existing building contributes significant character to the surrounding area.”

**Amendment**

Moved by Alderman McCullough,  
Seconded by Councillor Doran,

“That planning permission is granted, subject to conditions and a Section 76 planning agreement to secure a viability review.”

On a vote, six Members voted for the amendment and twelve against and it was declared lost.

The original proposal standing in the name of Councillor T. Brooks was put to the meeting, with twelve Members voting for and six against and it was declared carried.

The Committee agreed to delegate authority to the Director of Planning and Building Control to finalise the reasons for refusal.

**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 and part of ground floor level to 6 bed / 6 person HMO (amended description and plans). - 41 Rosetta Road**

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

- 129 third party objections had been received;
- The scheme was compliant with Policy HOU10 in that the 10% threshold for HMOs on that stretch of the Rosetta Road has not yet been reached;
- There was sufficient provision for bin storage whilst retaining sufficient amenity space;
- Ground floor to be retained as commercial;
- The ground floor retail extension was acceptable in principle; and
- DfI Roads had no concerns in terms of traffic and parking.

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 Chairperson welcomed Ms. P. Bradshaw MLA to the meeting, who attended in objection to the application.

Ms. Bradshaw explained that she was representing 129 objectors. She stated that it was an area of historic flooding and that the existing drainage infrastructure was overburdened and could not sustain additional demand and pointed out that NI Water had recommended refusal for those reasons.

She highlighted issues with regard to transport, parking and traffic, stating that no additional parking had been provided for within the proposal.

She stated that, in terms of overcrowding, the application site was the equivalent to a typical three-bed semi-detached house, however, the proposal was for more units than the property's footprint could accommodate.

She stated that the objectors were of the opinion that the location was unsuitable and the design was out of character with the surrounding properties. She explained that the area was typically quiet family orientated neighbourhood, with long term residents, and that residents had concerns with regard to noise, antisocial behaviour, transient occupation, disruption to the community cohesion, and feared that approval of the application would set a precedent within a traditionally residential area.

In response to a question from a Member with regard to the flooding history of the application site, Mr. C. Heath, who was in attendance for DfI Rivers, explained that applications are assessed on the sources of flooding and from the evidence provided. The source was out of sewer flooding from the drainage network which lay outside the site boundary. He stated that there was a small evidence of surface water flooding on the site, however, it was not significant enough to trigger a drainage assessment and pointed out that the revised site layout had provided soft landscaping which would aid in the mitigation of surface water runoff.

In response to a Member's question Mr. Heath confirmed that, if the proposal was to proceed, it would provide an improvement to the surface water drainage.

A Member asked Ms. C. Purvis, who was in attendance for DfI Roads, to outline why DfI Roads had stated that the parking provision within the proposal was adequate. Ms. Purvis explained that two parking surveys had been undertaken which indicated that available parking had been more than sufficient. The Member stated that she had attended a site visit at the application site and was not of the opinion that there was adequate parking provision and that the quality of the design was not in keeping with the existing context as the extension sat significantly forward of the existing building line and that there was known historical flooding at the application site.

**Proposal**

Moved by Councillor T. Brooks,  
Seconded by Councillor Brennan, and

Resolved - "That the Committee refuses to grant planning permission on the basis that the design of the proposal was not complementary to the surrounding area and delegates authority to the Director of Planning and Building Control to finalise the reasons for refusal."

**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**

The Planning Manager (Development Management) summarised the application for the Committee and referred to the following key issues for consideration:

- Policy HOU10 – the site was not within a Housing Management Area and the proposal fell under the 10% threshold for the number of HMOs on a residential street (there were currently 4 HMOs on the entire Falls Road and none within 300m either side of the site);
- No adverse impact on neighbour amenity;
- All rooms exceed the space standards;
- Parking survey demonstrated sufficient parking in the area with no objection from DfI Roads; and
- Sufficient bin storage/amenity space - the site was within a 12-minute walk of Bog Meadows Nature Reserve and a 10-minute walk from Falls Park.

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.

**Proposal**

Moved by Councillor Carson,  
Seconded by Councillor Garrett, and

Resolved – "That the Committee refuses to grant planning permission on the basis of the lack of parking provision which would greatly impact the amenity of local residents, contrary to Policy TRAN8."

The Committee agreed to delegate authority to the Director of Planning and Building Control to finalise the reasons for refusal

**LA04/2024/1865/O - 3no. detached dwellings part  
2 storey part 3 storey (amended plans) - Land  
between No 22 Squires View and Nos 57 and 59  
Squires Hill Road**

The Principal Planning Manager provided an overview of the application to the Committee and outlined the following key issues:

- Principle of residential dwellings at this location;
- Impact on existing residential;
- Housing density;
- Adaptable and accessible accommodation;
- Design;
- Amenity space;
- Overshadowing;
- Overlooking;
- Access and parking;
- Waste management;
- Landscaping and trees;
- Topography of the site; and
- Climate change.

She reported that 16 third party objections had been received and considered and stated that the proposal would result in the loss of open space, contrary to Policy OS1.

She stated that the proposal was not considered to be in conformity with the character of the area and would conflict with adjacent uses and appear overly dominant when viewed from the adjacent property, contrary to Policy RD1. She added that the proposal would not be of sufficient design quality due to inappropriate engineering operations, ground remodeling works and associated retaining structures, and would encroach beyond the established building line, contrary to Policy DES1.

She informed the Committee that, having regard to the development plan, planning history on the site and other material considerations, the proposal was considered unacceptable, and refusal was therefore recommended.

The Chairperson welcomed Mr. D. Monaghan, MBA Planning, who attended on behalf of the applicant.

Mr. Monaghan explained that the application site was zoned for housing development in the draft BMAP, not zoned for open space and did not function as open space.

He stated that, when the Squire's View development was approved in 2000, the site and adjoining land were shown on the landscape plan as undeveloped area, with two houses subsequently approved and built on the adjoining land.

He pointed out that the Planning Service claimed that the application was open space, however, an application to build four houses on the site was made in 2020 and the Planning Service had accepted that the site was not open space.

He stated that there had previously been complaints that the site attracted antisocial behaviour and to leave it unmanaged and underdeveloped would likely lead to further antisocial issues.

He referred to design issues and pointed out that the application was for outline planning permission and the drawings which had been submitted with the application were illustrative only and that final drawings would be agreed at the reserved matters state, should permission be granted.

He stated that the drawings demonstrated how three dwellings could be developed on the site in a manner that was sympathetic to its topography and to the character of the built development in the area.

He stated that the proposal would not create conflict with an adjoining property, that the site had been surveyed and that proposed dwellings 1 and 2 did not face in the same direction as the proposed replacement dwelling, while dwelling 3 was 40 metres from its rear elevation, which had no habitable room windows facing the site.

He concluded by stating that the site was not open space and was capable of delivering three high quality new dwellings that would not result in any harm to surrounding properties or the local environment.

A Member expressed his frustration that the application site was referred to as open space and it was locally known as waste ground and historically and that it was understood that houses were to be built on the site. He stated that the application would solve antisocial behaviour issues associated with the site. He added that the proposed retaining wall would retain the character of the area.

The Principal Planning Officer explained that the site was previously and currently zoned for housing and a housing development had been approved. She stated that the site did meet the requirement of being existing open space and, in its current form, the application was not considered acceptable.

The Chairperson enquired as to whether surveys had been undertaken in relation to subsidence at the application site. In response the Planning Manager stated that it would be an engineering issue for the developer to solve but could potentially become a planning issue and explained that the issue could be dealt with though a condition.

**Proposal**

Moved by Alderman McCullough,  
Seconded by Councillor Carson,

“That the Committee grants planning permission, subject to conditions and delegates authority to the Director of Planning and Building Control to finalise the wording of the conditions and to deal with the concerns about subsidence insofar as they may be relevant and any other issues that might arise, provided that they are not substantive.”

On a vote, thirteen Members voted for the proposal and five against and it was declared carried.

**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**

The Principal Planning Officer outlined the application and summarised the following key issues:

- Principle of residential dwellings at the location;
- Impact on existing residential dwellings;
- Housing density;
- Adaptable and accessible accommodation;
- Design;
- Amenity space;
- Overshadowing;
- Overlooking;
- Access and parking;
- Waste management;
- Landscaping and trees; and
- Climate change.

She reported that 11 third-party objections had been received and addressed within the report and that the proposal respected the topography of the site and would not result in overlooking, loss of privacy, overshadowing or dominance.

She stated that the proposal would be in conformity with the character of the existing residential area and that DfI Roads, BCC Tree Officer, Environmental Health and NI Water had offered no objections to the proposal.

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 Chairperson welcomed Mr. and Mrs. Coulter to the meeting, who attended in objection to the application.

Mrs. Coulter explained that she was speaking on behalf of the 17 households which were most affected and stated that there were factual inaccuracies within the case officer's report.

She outlined concerns with regard to the following areas:

- Size – that the size of the site had been overestimated;
- Overlooking, loss of light and overshadowing – obscure glass on ground floor would not address overlooking;
- Parking and access – the Council had begun using a smaller bin lorry due to parking issues; and
- Landscaping – a tree surgeon had confirmed that excavations would severely damage the root structure of the Scots Pine tree.

She stated that there were many more omissions and misinformation, that included limited dimensions, out of date site maps and listed the policies that she believed the proposal was contrary to.

She concluded by stating that a decision to approve the application would be based on inaccurate information that included the size of the site, which was inaccurate as to its distance from neighbouring properties. She added that local residents wanted the site to be developed, but in compliance with policies and respectful of the site whilst accommodating the topography and she asked the Committee to refuse the application.

A Member stated that she agreed with the concerns of the objectors in that there would be a degree of overlooking and that the root protection area of the existing trees conflicted with the proposed foundations.

The Planning Manager pointed out that BCC Tree Officer had offered no objection with regard to the existing trees.

### **Proposal**

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

“That the Committee refuses to grant planning permission on the basis that the design of the proposal was not complementary to the surrounding area and delegates authority to the Director of Planning and Building Control to finalise the reasons for refusal.”

On a vote, ten Members voted for the proposal with nine against and it was declared carried.

**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 Planning Manager summarised the application for the Committee which was being reported back as officers were recommending a change to the heads of terms in the Section 76 planning agreement in relation to the public realm.

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

**New Planning Applications**

**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**

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

- Principle of hotel development;
- Design and placemaking;
- Climate change;
- Access and transport;
- Health impacts;
- Environmental protection;
- Waste-water infrastructure;
- Waste management;
- Natural heritage;
- Section 76 legal agreement; and
- Pre-application community consultation.

She explained that the proposal did not include dedicated parking for the hotel which was considered to be acceptable given the highly sustainable city centre location and that a travel plan had been submitted which promoted alternatives to the private car.

She reported that DfI Roads, HED and NIEA had no objections to the proposal and that third party representations had been received in support of the proposed development.

She stated that, having regard to the Development Plan and all relevant material considerations, it was recommended that planning permission be granted, subject to conditions and a Section 76 legal agreement to secure employability and skills developer contributions.

The Chairperson welcomed Mr. G. Southall, Planning Agent attending on behalf of the applicant, to the meeting.

Mr. Southall explained that the applicant had worked collaboratively with Council officers to finalise the design and all other aspects of the proposal to secure officer endorsement and agreement on the recommendation to approve. He stated that the applicant had positively and extensively engaged with the local community which was evident from the letters of support.

He highlighted that the applicant was an award winning developer with a proven track record in delivering significant developments within Belfast city centre and that the proposal represented a significant investment in the city that would revitalise a long term vacant and derelict site to create a high quality new building.

The Committee granted planning permission, subject to conditions and a Section 76 Agreement to secure employability and skills developer contributions, and delegated authority to the Director of Planning and Building Control to finalise the wording of the conditions and to deal with any other issues that might arise, including the outstanding SES consultation, provided that they were not substantive.

**LA04/2024/2077/F - Proposed change of use from office space (B1) and storage or distribution (B4) to Bowling Alley, Restaurant, Indoor Golf, Children's Soft Play, VR Zone and Amusements, Smoking Area, Car Parking and Associated Site Works. Proposal includes changes to elevations and roof profile. (Change to Description). - Adelaide Business Centre 2-6 Apollo Road**

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

- Principle of change of use;
- Design and placemaking;
- Access and transport;
- Climate change;
- Health impacts;
- Environmental protection;
- Waste-water infrastructure;
- Waste storage;
- Employability and skills; and
- Pre-application community consultation.

She explained that the proposal involved alterations to the existing elevations which would reflect the proposed use and were in keeping with the surrounding context of the area.

She stated that, having regard to the Development Plan and all relevant material considerations, it was recommended that planning permission be granted, subject to conditions.

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

**LA04/2023/2868/F - Section 54 application to vary condition 04 of Planning permission Z/1996/0985 to allow for the sale of convenience goods, non bulky comparison goods and bulky comparison goods. (Amended Description). - Lesley Retail Park, Unit 1 Boucher Road**

The Principal Planning Officer outlined the application to the Committee and stated that, having regard to the Development Plan, relevant planning policies and consultation responses, it was recommended that the variation of condition be approved.

In response to a request from a Member with regard to an increase in non-bulky goods use within the Boucher Road area, the Principal Planning Officer agreed that future reports would include percentage growth statistics regarding type of use within the area.

The Committee approved the variation of condition 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 they were not substantive.

**LA04/2025/0537/F - Proposed erection of drive through café (amended design to that approved under LA04/2021/2815/F) and retention of amended parking layout, landscaping finishes, switchroom unit and associated site works (amendments to that approved under LA04/2021/2815/F - no change to supermarket building). - Lands at access to Olympia Leisure Centre, directly opposite and approx. 70m east of Nos 9-15 Boucher Road**

The Principal Planning Officer summarised the application and highlighted the following key issues:

- Principle of café and switchroom;
- Design and placemaking;
- Access and transport; and
- Impact on amenity.

She stated that, having regard to the Development Plan and all relevant material considerations, it was recommended that planning permission be granted, subject to conditions.

In response to a question from a Member with regard to traffic management proposals on match days at Windsor Park, Mr. D. Monaghan, Planning Agent, in attendance on behalf of the applicant, explained that the applicant, Lidl, currently engaged with PSNI, the Council and stadium operators on match days and would continue to do so.

The Committee approved the application 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 they were not substantive.

**LA04/2025/0311/A - Street Art directly on facade of Donegall Street Elevation - Telegraph Building, 124-144 Royal Avenue**

The Principal Planning Officer summarised the application and referred the Committee to the following key considerations:

- Impact on Listed Building;
- Impact on public safety; and
- Impact on amenity.

She explained that the Historic Environment Division (HED) and DfI Roads had been consulted and offered no objection. She stated that the proposed advertisement was of acceptable design quality and that, although large in scale, would contribute to a visually interesting streetscape and would not negatively impact on amenity.

The Committee approved the application 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 they were not substantive.

Chairperson