

Planning Committee

Monday, 27th June, 2022

HYBRID MEETING OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE

Members present: Councillor Whyte (Chairperson);
The High Sheriff, Councillor Hussey;
Alderman Rodgers;
Councillors Bower, Carson, Matt Collins, Douglas, Garrett,
Hanvey, Hutchinson,
Maskey, Murphy and Spratt.

Also present: Councillor McAteer.

In attendance: Ms. K. Bentley, Director of Planning and Building Control;
Mr. E. Baker, Planning Manager (Development Management);
Ms. N. Largey, Divisional Solicitor;
Mr. P. Fitzsimons, Principal Planning Officer;
Mr. M. McErlean, Senior Planning Officer;
Ms. U. Caddell, Senior Planning Officer; and
Ms. C. Donnelly, Democratic Services Officer.

Apologies

An apology for inability to attend was reported on behalf of Councillor Groogan.

Declarations of Interest

Councillor Whyte (Chairperson) declared an interest in relation to item 3a, LA04/2020/1959/F - Section 2 Forthmeadow Community Greenway, in that, he had previously engaged with objectors to the application. He also declared an interest in relation to item 3e, LA04/2021/1672/O - Gasworks Northern Fringe site, in that, he had worked with Radius Housing. He left the meeting for the duration of the items.

Councillor Maskey declared an interest in relation to item 3a, LA04/2020/1959/F - Section 2 Forthmeadow Community Greenway, in that he was employed by Intercomm. He left the meeting for the duration of the item.

Withdrawn Items

The Committee noted that the following item had been withdrawn from the agenda by officers:

- Proposed Abandonment

The following item was withdrawn by the applicant:

- LA04/2021/1231/O - Demolition of existing buildings and erection of 36. apartments in 2 blocks at 385 Hollywood Road

Planning Applications

(Reconsidered Item) LA04/2020/1959/F - New parkland (Section 2 Forthmeadow Community Greenway) - Foot and cycle pathways, lighting columns, new entrances and street furniture on site including vacant land bounded by the Forthriver Industrial Park in the east Springfield Road to the South and Paisley Park & West Circular Road & Crescent to the West. Area also includes links through the Forthriver

(The Chairperson, and Deputy Chairperson, Councillor Maskey, having declared an interest in the item, left the meeting while the item was under consideration.)

(Councillor Hanvey in the Chair.)

The Planning Manager explained that the application had been before the Committee in September 2021, where it had agreed to grant permission with delegated authority given to the Director of Planning and Building Control to finalise the wording of conditions.

He pointed out that the decision had been subject to Judicial Review, and that the Council had conceded on the single point of its application of the BUAP 2001, and that, the decision had been quashed, therefore, the application had been returned to the Committee for consideration.

The Committee's attention was drawn to the Late Items pack, which outlined correspondence that had been received in relation to the application, including appendices from Take Back the City Coalition and a link to the most up to date statistics on homelessness in the city from Participation and the Practice of Right (PPR). The Planning Manager set out the contents of the late items report and he referred the Committee to a summary of correspondence which had been received, which included an open letter to Members, a solicitors speaking statement which had been prepared on behalf of objectors to the application, a copy of a quashing order, a letter from Take Back the City to key stakeholders, correspondence from Invest NI, press cuttings and a hyperlink to a Sustrans web page regarding the Forth Meadow Community Greenway. He outlined the concerns which had been raised in the late items and provided the Committee with the Council officers' response to those issues. In particular, he pointed out that the substantive policy issues raised were addressed in the new report and he informed the Committee that, the issues which had been raised about a specific individual, were not material planning considerations and had been forwarded to the relevant Council department to consider and respond in due course. He added that, objectors had sufficient time to consider the Committee report.

The Planning Manager made reference to paragraph 4.17 of the SPPS and addressed the concerns around prematurity of the LDP process. He advised that the Committee must consider the application which was before it, and that any subsequent application which may seek to deliver alternatives envisaged by the objectors would be

carefully considered, having regard to relevant planning policy and all other material considerations.

The Planning Manager outlined the application which sought full planning permission for parkland, which included foot and cycle pathways, lighting columns, new entrances and street furniture. He added that, the proposal formed Section 2 of the wider Forthmeadow Community Greenway, a 12km route that provided connectivity through the west and north of the city.

He outlined the physical constraints of the project, stating that it had been apparent from the Members' site visit and photographs, that a large part of the site was physically constrained as there was a steep ravine from the river up to the edge of the site, a narrow plateau, which formed the central part of the site. He added that parts of the site were undulating and that excavations would be required to develop the site with buildings.

He informed the Committee that the proposal was contrary to Policy IND 6 of the BUAP in that, the lands had been zoned for industrial and commercial use and that the proposal was not an economic development use listed in the policy. He added that the proposal had been considered as consistent with Policy IND 5 of the BUAP, which sought to encourage environmental improvement of industrial estates and was contrary to the employment zonings, however it had been considered as consistent with the Key Site Requirement for retention of landscaping on the western boundary and supplemented trees and planting.

He pointed out to the Committee that, the Strategic Planning Policy Statement did not apply to the site as not all elements within the zone land were equally developable and that large parts of the site were not considered to be well located or suited for economic development purposes.

The Planning Manager reported that, the proposal was contrary to Policy PED 7 of PPS 4, and explained that, the Planning Advice Note to PPS 4 accepted that, there could be special circumstances in which a departure from the development plan zoning could be acceptable, however those special circumstances were not defined and that officers had advised that there were a number of special circumstances that the Committee should consider, in that the proposal:

- Was consistent with the aims of Policy IND 5 of BUAP;
- Was consistent with the Key Site Requirements in dBMAP in relation to landscaping;
- Involved land that had significant physical restraints;
- That there was a significant oversupply of employment space in the area; and
- Was a key component of the wider Forthmeadow Community Greenway.

He explained that employment zoning would remain and that the development would not preclude future development of the applications site for employment or housing and that, the proposed greenway had been considered as well suited, given the site's physical constraints for built development and that funding was in place to establish a greenway in the location.

He stated that there had been no objections from statutory or non-statutory consultees and that objections had been received from Participation and the Practice of Rights (PPR), Take Back our City and Town and Country Planning Associations

He concluded by informing the Committee that, although the proposal was contrary to Policy IND 6 of the BUAP, there were material considerations which were considered to justify the grant of planning permission and that, officers recommended that planning permission should be granted.

The Chairperson welcomed and Ms. C. Trew, Ms. M. McMahon and Mr. S. Brady, from Participation and the Practice of Rights (PPR) and their Solicitor, Mr. N. Quinn. to the meeting.

Mr. Quinn informed the Members that he was asking the Committee to refuse the proposal on the basis that, there were more efficient uses for the land to produce both a greenway and either housing development or employment. He explained that, the Forthriver valley physically split the Mackie's land and cannot be used for buildings and was the logical centrepiece of a fully planned Mackie's site. He stated that the proposal ignored the Forthriver valley, which would become a no-man's-land and most likely attract antisocial behaviour, he added that it would have no physical connection with the Mackie's land and therefore could not be used as either ancillary or complementary to any project.

Mr. Quinn stated that PPR were of the opinion that, a better use of the site would be to establish a mixed use development with a greenway at the centre, overlooked and protected from antisocial behaviour, in accordance with the current zoning. He added that, the land remained zoned for employment and was protected from non-employment uses by SPPS 4, policy 7 and the emerging policy EC4 of the Local Development Plan Strategy.

He outlined to the Committee that there were two clear reasons for refusal:

- Loss of employment land
- Ancillary development or use would be secondary to the main use.

He said that PPR were respectfully suggesting that there was a better way and that the application should be refused and the whole of the land should be replanned, he informed the Members that, PPR had begun the process and had launched an international masterplan design competition, the winner of which would be announced in August, which would serve as a blueprint for the development of the site which would benefit the whole of the city and added that, if they proposal was to proceed it would significantly harm the site's potential.

Ms. McMahon, on behalf of Take Back the City, explained that she was not clear on the position of the Irish Government or the European Union on the project funding and concerns which had been raised. She added that, she was not clear on the Department for Communities position on the project, who own the land, or the Department for Infrastructure's position.

The Chairperson welcomed Mr. D. Anderson from McAdam Design, on behalf of the Applicant, to the meeting. Mr. Anderson stated that the proposals comprised a key

part of the project which aimed to enable reconciliation and interaction between divided communities, regeneration for local neighbourhoods and would break down many physical and metaphorical barriers which existed through the creation of a network of shared open spaces.

He informed the Committee that McAdam Design had conducted an extensive set of public consultations and that project designs had been developed based on the feedback and principles established throughout the consultation events.

He pointed out to the Committee that the project had secured over £5M of public funding, which was subject to the terms in the respective letters of offer and was timebound with a final spend date of December, 2022 from SEUPB and March, 2023 for DfI/DfC funding and that any slippage in the programme would result in a loss of funding. He added that, to date, there had been over £3.2M expended on the project, which included Glencairn, Clarendon Park, Springfield Dam and ongoing works at Bog Meadows and Falls Park.

He concluded by stating that, the proposal was an integral element of the project and that the design provided a high-quality path network and shared space which linked communities, and that a contractor for the Forthmeadow Greenway had been appointed, and was awaiting instruction to proceed with the works at the Mackies site.

Ms. Trew pointed out that Council officers had stressed that the topography of the land was extremely challenging, and questioned that, if that had been the case, what had been the purpose of a greenway that would remain completely unconnected to the employment land of which it was supposed to be ancillary to.

Mr. Brady stated that he had experienced difficulties gaining information from officers and that there were no technical, legal or planning barriers that could not be overcome on the Mackies site, in order to deliver homes. He added that, the facts of the case had not been explored and the absence of input from DfI, DfC, EU, SEPUB and the Irish Government, relating to concerns that had been raised, particularly, the involvement of key stakeholders in the development and delivery of the programme, and that, the committee was not in possession of the facts in relation to the case and would not be able to fully consider the facts.

The Divisional Solicitor stated that the Judicial Review had challenged the Council because it had failed to adequately consider policies that would protect the economic zoning of the site, and that the decision had been quashed due to a technical policy in relation to employment and the issue had been addressed. She added that, the report before the Committee did not relate to any new information which had been provided by the applicant and was a reconsideration of information which had been provided through the course of the planning process and had been publicly available.

She addressed the query from Mr. Brady with regard to input from statutory consultees, and stated that, the Committee was a planning authority which applied planning policy, and that the objections which had been raised, were in relation to an individual and the broader consultation that had taken place by the Council, which were matters for the department of the Council concerned with the delivery of the project, and that those concerns had been raised with the Department, and would be responded to

in due course. She reminded the Committee that its role was to assess the acceptability of the application, having regard to planning policy and relevant material considerations.

Moved by Councillor Hussey,
Seconded by Councillor Douglas,

That the Committee agrees to approve the application and grant delegated authority to the Director of Planning and Building Control to finalise the wording of the conditions.

On a recorded vote, seven Members voted for the proposal and one against, with two no votes, and it was declared carried.

<u>For 7</u>	<u>Against 1</u>	<u>No Vote 2</u>
Councillors Carson, Douglas, Garrett, Hussey, Hutchinson, Murphy and Spratt.	Councillor Matt Collins.	Councillor Hanvey (Chairperson); and Councillor Bower.

(Reconsidered Item) LA04/2019/0775/F - 18 dwellings to include revision of site layout of previous approval Z/2007/1401/F at sites 2-8 (7 dwellings) and additional 11 No. dwellings, including landscaping, access via Hampton Park and other associated site works on lands approximately 50m to the north of 35 Hampton Park and approximately 30m to the west of 60 Hampton Park, Galwally

(Councillor Whyte, Chairperson, resumed the Chair.)

The Planning Manager reported that the application had previously been considered by the Committee in August, 2021 and January, 2022 and that a site visit had taken place in September 2021. He pointed out that 272 objections had been received and that there had been no objections from statutory consultees and reminded the Committee that, it had deferred the application at its meeting in January, 2022 in order that officers would investigate the possibility of attaching a condition or planning agreement to the application to ensure a right of access through the site for use by the general public.

He referred the Committee to the Late Items Report, that provided clarity as to the location of existing live applications in the vicinity of the application site and reported that a late representation had been received which had expressed concern about the proposed Section 76 Agreement, in that access should also be for wheelchair users and prams, that permitted closures would be too broad and that the path could be closed for long periods, and outlined concerns with regard to a lack of alternative routes, the makeup of the management company and the frequency of meetings with residents.

He provided the Committee with an overview of the site through a series of maps which outlined the position of the site, the development limit and access points, and elevation drawings of the proposed dwellings. He explained that the proposed pathway was two metres wide and would be finished in resin-bound rubber mulch leading to the Lagan Valley Regional Park.

The Planning Manager referred the Committee to the draft terms of the Section 76 planning agreement and outlined the main obligations. He reported that, officers were recommending that the application should be approved, subject to a Section 76 planning agreement, on the basis that the principle of the development had been established through the existing extant permissions and that it was generally respectful to the surrounding context and character of the immediate locality. He added that, following consultation with the Northern Ireland Environment Agency, it was considered that, the application complied with the policy tests of PPS 2, subject to conditions, which mitigated potential ecological impacts.

He concluded by stating that, it was considered that, the proposed development complied with planning policy in relation to residential amenity, amenity space, protection of open space, flooding, drainage, infrastructure, landscaping and archaeological heritage.

The Chairperson welcomed Mr. W. Orbinson QC, on behalf of the Applicant, to the meeting. Mr. Orbinson reported that the Applicant had engaged constructively with the Council's officers on the drafting of a Section 76 Agreement and was pleased that it had been recommended for approval by the Committee.

The Divisional Solicitor reported that, permitted closures in order to assert rights of proprietorship would only be permitted for up to 72 hours, unless there had been previous consent of the Council.

Councillor McAteer was in attendance at the Committee and the Chair invited her to comment on the application. Councillor McAteer stated that she had concerns around the permitted closures and that the Divisional Solicitor's aforementioned advice had been reassuring, she added that she was content that the path would be accessible but that she had concerns regarding the ongoing management of the access and footway, and recommended that the meetings with residents would take place on a monthly basis, rather than quarterly, particularly during the construction phase of the project.

In response to Councillor McAteer's comments, the Divisional Solicitor reported that, the agreement provided that the land would transfer to the residents' management company, and that they would be under the same obligation to provide and retain the access subject to permitted closures.

The Committee approved the application and granted delegated authority to the Director of Planning and Building Control to finalise the wording of the conditions and the Section 76 Planning Agreement.

**LA04/2019/1819/F & LA04/2019/1820/DCA –
Demolition of existing dwelling and erection of
3 storey (and basement) detached dwelling with
garage and landscaping to front and rear at
28 Malone Park**

Moved by Councillor Spratt;
Seconded by Councillor Whyte and

Resolved – That the Members of the Committee agree defer consideration of the application to enable a site visit to be undertaken in order to allow the Members to acquaint themselves with the location and the proposals at first hand.

LA04/2022/0140/F - Change of use from an indoor trampoline park to retail, Units E-F, Westwood Shopping Centre, 51 Kennedy Way

The Principal Planning Officer provided the Committee with an overview of the application site and outlined the proposal to change the use of the units from an indoor trampoline park to a retail supermarket and that the proposal for retail use related to a premises located within a retail shopping centre, designated as a district centre in Belfast Metropolitan Area Plan (BMAP) and complied with the Development Plan and accorded with the retail policies in Strategic Planning Policy Statement (SPPS).

He reported that the local development plan team had been consulted with and had no objections, subject to planning conditions and that officers were satisfied that the proposal would not prejudice protected centres.

He explained that there were minimal elevational changes, in keeping with the use and character of the shopping centre. He reported that Environmental Health had no objections in relation to noise or disturbance but had requested an air quality screening assessment and that additional information had been submitted by the applicant which sought to demonstrate that the proposal would not result in detrimental air quality impact, relating to traffic impact and would be assessed and verified as part of an assessment in consultation with Environmental Health.

He added that, DfI Roads and NI Water did not submit any objections to the application and that officers recommended that the Committee approved the application subject to conditions.

The Chairperson welcomed Mr. P. Stinson, Director, Turley, to the meeting, and asked if he could clarify whether the retail unit would increase the traffic volumes in the area, as it was in an air quality management area. Mr. Stinson stated that the current level of parking at the existing centre had not been fully utilised, evidenced by surveys that had been undertaken on two survey dates which had taken place in January and that the proposal would not increase the traffic above the current capacity of the car park.

The Committee approved the application and granted delegated authority to the Director of Planning and Building Control to finalise the wording of the conditions and resolve any outstanding matters with regard to air quality.

LA04/2021/1672/O - Hybrid planning permission for mixed use development on lands at the Gasworks Northern Fringe site

(The Chairperson, having declared an interest in the item, left the meeting while the item was under consideration.)

(Deputy Chairperson, Councillor Maskey in the Chair.)

The Senior Planning Officer provided the Committee with an overview of the site location, that included a layout of the proposed development and elevation images, in order to convey the residential context and indicative public realm of the application.

He presented a 3D context of the Gasworks Masterplan which illustrated how the overall site would look like post-development. He stated that there was a balance to the proposed development and that, any loss of industrial land would be outweighed by wider community benefits on a generous level of business, commercial and community uses which would provide a sustainable job creation package for a site largely vacant of any recent industrial or employment uses, as it had been vacant for some time.

He informed the Members that, officers had recommended that the Committee would approve the application, subject to conditions and developer contributions having been sought through a legal agreement between the Council, as the landowner, and the developer or developers, when the site was leased or disposed of.

The Senior Planning Officer pointed out to the Committee that there were 268 third party representations received that were in support of the social housing and mixed-use elements of the proposal, and that, some had raised concerns regarding the delivery and operation of some of the elements of the proposals. He outlined the reasons for recommending approval of the application, which included:

- A mixed-use scheme that provided high quality city centre social housing alongside appropriate city centre uses;
- Creation of vibrant, city centre space;
- Regeneration;
- Enhancement of the existing civic spaces and creation of strong mixed-use frontages; and
- Provision of connections between commercial, business, offices uses and existing and proposed residential areas.

The Chairperson welcomed Mr. A. Bullock, AECOM, Ms. D. Quinn, Radius Housing, Mr. A. Crozier, TODD Architects and Mr. F. Hargey, Market Development Association, to the meeting.

Mr. Hargey stated that the sites which were under consideration were among the first developed for housing in the South Inner City and that the development was the culmination of two decades of campaigning by Market residents, having collected petitions, lobbied political representatives, participated in the consultation process and, when necessary, protested to secure the homes.

He pointed out that, the community had over 110 homeless families on the waiting list annually, and that, the 94 new homes would have a considerable impact. He referred to the links between homelessness, poor mental health and poor educational attainment and that, the development would contribute to the reduction of wider social deprivations within the community.

He reported that the elements of the masterplan which designated adjoining lands for community infrastructure, social economy and cooperative development had been welcomed by the local residents and stated that successful communities were built on more than houses, and that those spaces would help overcome the structural deficiencies of the Market community's redevelopment in the 1970's, when it's mixed economic base had been divested.

He highlighted that local residents remained concerned regarding the negative attitude of the prospective developer, Inislyn Ltd., toward the Market community and had noted that Planners had refused to cognisance Inislyn's demands that the community be deprived of housing and isolated through social interfaces.

He concluded by stating that the residents were welcoming of the Radius proposal to build 94 much needed new homes, and those social components of the wider masterplan which would help build a sustainable community, and that, while the community struggled for decades to secure a place at the table, he believed that this will now be looked on as a model for socially inclusive development in the city and would urge Councillors to vote in favour of the application.

Mr. Bullock added that the importance of the project should not be understated as the proposal would regenerate a currently vacant and underutilised brownfield site located in the heart of the city. He stated that the proposed development had been designed to provide a balance of high-quality social housing alongside employment and community uses.

He reported that the Northern Ireland Housing Executive and the neighbouring Market Development Association had indicated support for the mixed-use scheme and that the proposal was the best possible response a very constrained urban site. He outlined the benefits of the development on the local area and wider city.

The Committee approved the application and granted delegated authority to the Director of Planning and Building Control to finalise the wording of the conditions and the Section 76 Planning Agreement resolve any outstanding issues and notify the Department for Infrastructure, in accordance with the Planning (Notification of Applications) Direction 2017.

**LA04/2022/0535/F & LA04/2022/0468/DCA –
Re-cladding of the exterior of the former
BHS building at 13-25 Castle Lane Belfast**

(Councillor Whyte, Chairperson, resumed the Chair.)

The Senior Planning Officer explained to the Committee that the application was for the re-cladding of the exterior of the building, creation of a new access point to the upper floors and central core on Castle Arcade, demolition of bridge link over Castle Arcade and the erection of a new oversail section at the junction of Castle Lane and Castle Arcade. She added that the application included a partial change of use of the upper floors from storage and back of house facilities to a mixed-use of Assembly and Leisure, a sui-generis multifaceted leisure use combined with the sale of food and drink for consumption on the premises and the reconfiguration of existing ground floor storage, associated public realm improvements and ancillary development.

She provided the Committee with an overview of the site location, with images of the exterior of the existing premises on Castle Lane and Cornmarket and the proposed demolition. She added that the existing building was considered to be of no historic or architectural value and the proposed demolition was considered acceptable and compliant with policy.

She provided the Committee with images of the proposed layout of the site and proposed elevations and views. She explained that the Conservation Officer had expressed views that the proposal would be harmful to the conservation area through a contrast of materials and would undermine the dominance of the listed heritage asset of the Masonic Hall, however the Historic Environment Division (HED) had considered the proposed use of the cladding was appropriate as it complemented other buildings in the immediate area.

She outlined proposed public realm improvements and concluded by stating that the proposal had been recommended for approval by officers for the undernoted reasons:

- The proposal complied with the Development Plan and relevant Planning Policy;
- Significant benefits included physical and economic regeneration, the re-use of a vacant building, environmental improvements, improved connectivity in the city centre; and
- Enhancement of the conservation area;

The Chairperson welcomed Mr. M. Worthington, Pragma Planning, to the meeting who stated that, the main area of interest in the application centred around the design and that the design had ensured high quality of design that was appropriate for the setting and added that the Applicant was content with the proposed planning conditions.

The Committee agreed to approve applications LA04/2022/0535/F and LA04/2022/0468/DCA and granted delegated authority to the Director of Planning and Building Control to finalise the wording of the conditions.

LA04/2021/2519/F - Variation of Condition relating to Operating Hours at Former Church of the Holy Rosary, 348-350 Ormeau Road

At the request of the Chairperson, it was:

Resolved – That the Members of the Committee agree defer consideration of the application to enable a site visit to be undertaken in order to allow the Members to acquaint themselves with the location and the proposals at first hand.

Miscellaneous Items

Local Applications with NI Water Objections

The Planning Manager reported that officers had been engaging with NI Water over the previous months to resolve several objections which had been submitted against applications on the grounds of insufficient waste-water infrastructure capacity.

He referred to the Scheme of Delegation and pointed out that, where NI Water had lodged an objection to a local application where the officer recommendation was to approve, the decision must be brought to the Committee and could not be taken under the Scheme of Delegation.

He reported that there were 97 undetermined planning applications subject to NI Water objections, for which officers could, in theory, recommend for approval. In accordance with the Scheme of Delegation, should all those applications be recommended for approval, all 97 applications would need to be reported to the Committee for a decision and would therefore be logistically extremely difficult to report all 97 applications individually, potentially requiring several sittings of the Planning Committee to hear each of the applications, and would be both costly and time consuming, as well as causing further delays for applicants in circumstances where officers do not consider the objections from NI Water to be reasonable.

He explained to the Committee that NI Water had been concerned that a lack of infrastructure capacity would give rise to risk of environmental harm including pollution, flooding and adverse impact on existing property, and in some cases, NI Water was concerned that the application site may be hydrologically linked to Belfast Lough and may harm its water quality.

He stated that, despite requests, NI Water had not provided robust evidence to support its objections, including demonstration of actual specific impacts resulting from individual proposals that stems from their broad concerns outlined above.

The Planning Manager informed the Committee that the Council must be mindful that, were it to refuse planning permission based on NI Water's concerns, it would need to provide robust evidence to the Planning Appeals Commission in the event that the applicant appeals the decision, and in the absence of robust evidence, it would be unreasonable to refuse planning permission.

He drew the Committee's attention to the list of local applications which had been proposed to be delegated to officers to determine.

The Committee agreed to delegate authority to the Director of Planning and Building Control, those local planning applications to which NI Water had objected, as set out at Appendix 1 of the report.

Updated Schedule of Planning Committee Workshops

The Director of Planning and Building Control provided the Committee with the following schedule of Planning Committee workshops:

Committee	Workshop Topic
August 2022	No workshop
September 2022	Review of the Planning Committee Operating Protocol
October 2022	Principles of decision making including "on balance" decisions
November 2022	New regional Planning IT system (what it means for the Council's Planning Service, Customers and Online applications)
December 2022	Local Development Plan & Supplementary Planning Guidance
January 2023	Local Development Plan & Supplementary Planning Guidance

February 2023	Planning Conditions, Planning Agreements and Developer Contributions
March 2023	Place Making (Urban Design and Conservation)
April 2023	To be decided
May 2023	To be decided
June 2023	Annual Performance for 2022/23 and Improvement

The Committee agreed to the updated Schedule of Planning Committee Workshops for the period August 2022 to August 2023.

Restricted Item

The information contained in the report associated with the following item is restricted in accordance with Part 1 of Schedule 6 of the Local Government Act (Northern Ireland) 2014.

Resolved – That the Committee agrees to exclude the members of the Press and public from the meeting during discussion of the item as, due to the nature of the item, there would be a disclosure of exempt information as described in Section 42(4) and Section 6 of the Local Government Act (Northern Ireland) 2014.

Update on Planning Portal replacement IT system

The Director of Planning and Building Control updated the Committee on the progress of the implementation of the new regional Planning IT System to be shared by Belfast City Council, nine other councils and the Department for Infrastructure.

She outlined the following elements of the project to the Committee:

- Project Plan and implementation;
- Contingency;
- Configuration;
- Change requests;
- Project costs;
- Intelligent Client Function;
- Change and transition plans; and
- Next steps.

The Committee noted the content of the report and agreed that monthly updates on the project should be provided to future meetings.

Chairperson