

# Planning Committee

Tuesday, 13th December, 2016

## MEETING OF PLANNING COMMITTEE

Members present: Councillor Johnston (Chairperson);  
Councillors Armitage, Dorrian, Garrett, Hussey,  
Magee, McAteer and Mullan.

In attendance: Mr. P. Williams, Director of Planning and Place;  
Mr. E. Baker, Development Engagement Manager;  
Mr. J. Walsh, City Solicitor;  
Ms. N. Largey, Divisional Solicitor;  
Mr. S. McCrory, Democratic Services Manager; and  
Miss. E. McGoldrick, Democratic Services Officer.

### Apologies

Apologies were reported on behalf of Alderman McGimpsey and Councillors Bunting, Carson, Hutchinson, Jones and Lyons.

### Minutes

The minutes of the meeting of 15th November 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 December, subject to the omission of those matters in respect of which the Council had delegated its powers to the Committee.

### Declaration of Interest

Regarding item 12. m) LA04/2016/2170/F - 2 storey rear extension and single storey porch to front at 3 Strathmore Park South, Councillor Magee declared an interest in that he was the applicant of the planning application.

### Committee Site Visit - 29th November 2016

Pursuant to its decision of 15th November, it was noted that the Committee had undertaken a site visit on 29th November in respect of planning application LA04/2016/1644/F - Development of a Three Storey Building, Housing 5 One Bed Apartments with 6 Parking Spaces at 1 Stockman's Way.

### Quarter 2 Finance Report for Planning and Place

The Committee noted the contents of a report which provided an overview of the financial position of both the Planning and Licensing Committees, as at the end of the second quarter of the financial year. It was noted further that there had been a net departmental underspend of £315,000, with the forecast year end position being an underspend of £460,000.

### **Planning Appeals Notified**

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

### **Planning Decisions Notified**

The Committee noted a list of decisions which had been taken under delegated authority by the Director of Planning and Place, together with all other planning decisions which had been issued by the Planning Department between 7th November and 5th December.

### **Departmental Performance Update**

The Development Engagement Manager provided the following information on the Department's performance to date:

#### *Planning Applications*

- 164 applications had been validated in November, 2016. (147 in October, 2016);
- Applications validated had decreased by 14% from the same month last year; and
- Overall numbers of applications validated this year had increased by 18% (1,170 up to 30th November, 2015 compared to 1,433 up to 30th November, 2016).

#### *Planning Decisions*

- 167 decisions had been issued in November, 2016.
- 94% approval rate;
- 89% decisions had been issued under delegated authority; and
- the number of decisions issued to date had increased by 40% over the same period in 2015. (866 up to 30th November, 2015 compared to 1, 443 up to 30th November, 2016).

#### *No. of applications in system by length of time*

- 1,051 live applications were in the system at end of October, 2016 (1,056 in October, 2016);
- 61% of applications were in the system for less than 6 months; and
- Less than 40 legacy applications were outstanding (reduced from 780 at transfer in April, 2015).

#### *Performance against statutory targets (figures available up to 30th October)*

- The statutory target for processing major development planning applications from the date valid to decision issued or withdrawal

date was within an average of 30 weeks. Up to 31st October, 2016 the average processing time to decide major applications was 67 weeks. This, however, included legacy applications and those Major applications which had been delayed whilst a Section 76 agreement had been put in place. The Development Engagement Manager pointed out that, for those Major applications dealt with exclusively by the Council, the average processing time was 37 weeks. He highlighted that for those applications that included a Section 76 agreement it had taken 53 weeks to process (planning agreements therefore adding approximately 16 weeks to the decision making process);

- The statutory target for processing local development planning applications from the date valid to decision issued or withdrawal date was an average of 15 weeks. Up to 31st October, 2016, the average processing time to decide local applications was 14.6 weeks; and
- The statutory target was that 70% of all enforcement cases are progressed to target conclusion within 39 weeks of receipt of complaint. Between 1st April and 31st October, 2016, 75.9% of enforcement cases had been concluded within 39 weeks.

Noted.

**Consultation response to Department for Infrastructure on LA04/2016/2637/F - Applications to vary conditions, Royal Exchange.**

The Committee was advised that a consultation request had been received by the Department for Infrastructure (DfI) for the proposed application to vary conditions 2-4, 6, 8-13, 14-18, 21-22, 25, 27, 29, 30-31, 33 of planning permission Z/2010/1532/F for the demolition, redevelopment and part change of use of existing buildings to create mixed use development known as Royal Exchange. It was reported that this comprised of retail, offices, café/bar use, apartments, car parking, cultural/arts centre, hotel and associated access and circulation and public realm works, including restoration, alteration and the extension of listed buildings.

It was reported that the site was located at lands bounded by 31-101 Royal Avenue, Church Street, William Street, Writers Square, 40 to 16 Donegall Street, 2 Waring Street, 1-21 Bridge Street, 2-18 High Street, 1-27 Lombard Street, 33-55 Rosemary Street, North Street and 2-14 Lower Garfield Street.

The Development Engagement Manager summarised the draft response to the DfI, in that:

- the Council welcomed this positive step towards commencing the Royal Exchange Planning Approval in regenerating the northeast quarter of the city in line with the Belfast Metropolitan Area Plan (BMAP) and Belfast City Council's Regeneration Strategy;

- it was critical that condition 4 of Z/2010/1532/F should also be amended. As subsequent to any approval of the variations could potentially allow for significant piecemeal demolition of an area which made up 20% of Belfast's primary retail core as defined in the Local Development Plan. The impact of this could be of significant detriment to a number of listed buildings as well as the City Centre's historic integrity and the ability to attract long term investment to this area of the city. Belfast City Council would also raise concerns on the implementation of any proposed phasing without the authority retaining some level of control; and
- condition 4 be amended to ensure through phasing that no demolition or construction works took place until a phasing and implementation programme had been submitted and agreed with the Department and the construction contract was entered into under each phase which had been agreed under condition 4 and that there were assurances and commitment to the construction on the new building(s) to be developed prior to any demolition.

The Committee agreed that the response, as outlined in Appendix 3 (copy available on the Council's website), be issued to the Department for Infrastructure's (DfI) Strategic Planning Division on behalf of the Council, in particular:

- Belfast City Council offered no objection in principle to the variation of condition application which would pave the way for the commencement and implementation of planning approval Z/2010/1532/F, however, requested that the DfI gave consideration to a new varied Condition 4, to read:

*"No development shall commence on site until a phasing plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Department. No demolition or development within a particular phase shall commence until a valid contract has been agreed for the whole development of that phase in its entirety, in accordance with details that shall have first been submitted to and approved in writing by the Department."*

The Committee also delegated power to the Director of Planning and Place to resolve any additional issues arising from this consultation and to further respond to the DfI that a Planning Appeal Commission Hearing would not be requested provided that the Notice of Opinion was to grant planning permission, in line with the formal response of the Council.

**Response to Lisburn and Castlereagh City Council Consultation on LA05/2016/0700/O - Site for a new cemetery on land north of 10 Quarterland Road, Dundrod**

With permission of the Chairperson, the Director tabled a report regarding an update on the Loughview Park Cemetery planning application. He advised that notification had been received by the Department for Infrastructure which sought a

response in relation to the planning application which was being dealt with by Lisburn and Castlereagh City Council.

He summarised the draft response and highlighted that whilst the Council had no specific planning comments in relation to the merits of the submitted application it would like to provide Lisburn and Castlereagh Council with some contextual information in respect of the projected need and demand for burial provision.

The Committee approved the submission of the consultation response to the DfI as outlined in Appendix 1 (copy available on the Council's website).

**Notification of Proposal of Application Notice - Gas fired generation station at Belfast Harbour Estate**

The Committee noted the receipt of correspondence from the Department for Infrastructure, which related to the Proposal of Application Notice or the erection of a 480MW CCGT gas fired power generation station with associated development, including the construction of an underground gas pipeline connection between existing Knocknagoney Gas Pressure Reduction Station and the power generation site which had been received on 18th October.

**Notice of Intention Extinguishment of Public Rights of Way - Ravenhill Reach**

The Committee noted the receipt of correspondence from the Department for Communities, which related to the extinguishment of a Public Rights of Way at lands at rear of Ravenhill Reach and Ravenhill Reach Mews to Ballarat Street.

**TransportNI - Development at York Road , Adoption Notification**

The Committee noted the receipt of correspondence from the Department for Infrastructure, which related to the adoption certification at York Road (at Grove Health and Wellbeing Centre).

**Miscellaneous Items**

**Restricted Item**

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

(Councillors Dorrian and Hussey had left the room whilst the item was under consideration).

**Local Development Plan Preferred Options Update - Technical Supplements**

The Committee was provided with an update regarding the Local Development Plan Preferred Options, which included the following technical reports that covered a range of issue to assist the Planning Department to formulate its policies and proposals:

- Sustainability Appraisal (SA) Interim Report: The SA promoted sustainable development by assessing the extent to which the emerging plan would help to achieve the environmental, economic and social objectives;
- Countryside Assessment: identified the city's environmental features including rural and countryside assets;
- Equality Impact Assessment Screening and progress report: identified those policies that were likely to have an impact on equal opportunities and good relations; and
- 17 Position Papers: Evidence-based papers to inform the plan.

The Committee was advised that the technical documents would accompany the Preferred Options Paper (POP) when it was formally published.

It was also highlighted that the proposed POP consultation programme would commence in January until April, 2017 and included a range of engagement methods:

- a launch;
- citywide information events;
- area engagement information and drop in events;
- bespoke engagement activity and briefings with key partners/stakeholder/Section 75 groups;
- consultation workshop events around the strategic aims;
- engagement with statutory consultees; and
- internal information updates and staff briefings.

After discussion, the Committee noted the contents of the report, in particular:

- the additional technical documents that would accompany the Local Development Plan on publication; and
- the proposed consultation approach commencing in early 2017.

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

### **Developer Contribution Framework**

The Development Engagement Manager provided an update on the progress of establishing a Framework for planning agreements and securing developer contributions, together with an update of the contributions which have been secured to date.

He advised that the first part of the Framework would include the Councils legal and policy basis for developer contributions, strategic alignment, infrastructure and viability and monitoring arrangements covering the operational aspects of the policy.

The second part of the Framework would set out the types of obligations which might be required depending on the nature, size and impacts of the development being applied for and clearly set the formulae and methodology by which the Council shall identify the contribution levels which might be sought. He confirmed that this element of the Framework was critical in highlighting the types of obligations required, the planning

policy justification and the levels of contributions which would be sought, whilst provided the development industry with the certainty that it needed to progress development proposals.

He outlined the proposed timetable for the launch of the Developer Contributions Framework and pointed out that Party Briefings would take place in January so that feedback could be considered prior to bringing forward the Framework to consultation.

He also advised that, to assist the process, evidence based research was proposed to be undertaken to include economic and market analysis of the city with a view to present research findings to the Committee in March, seeking approval to launch the Framework for Public Consultation.

The Committee noted the contents of the report and agreed:

- that Party Briefings be held in January on Part One of the Framework and the document be issued to Members in advance of the Briefings for consideration; and
- to the forward work programme as set out in Appendix 1 - Developer Contributions Timetable (copy available on the Council's website).

### **Charging Framework for Pre Application Discussions**

The Committee considered the following report:

#### **“1.0 Purpose of report or summary of main issues**

**1.1 The purpose of this report is to seek the Committee's agreement to the draft Scale of Charging for Pre-Application Discussions.**

#### **2.0 Recommendations**

**2.1 The Committee is asked to agree the draft Scale of Charging for Pre-Application Discussions found at Appendix 1 with a view to informal consultation with stakeholders, including agents, developers and landowners.**

#### **3.0 Main report**

#### **3.1 Background**

**At its meeting of 18th October, the Committee agreed that the Director of Planning & Place should investigate a Scale of Charging for Pre-Application Discussions ('PADS').**

**The Strategic Planning Policy Statement for Northern Ireland ('SPPS'), adopted September 2015, recognises that PADS are '*...fundamental to 'front loading' the new development***

*management system. This front loading will help all parties, both to prepare an application to a high standard and to establish an agreed course and timetable for determining a development proposal'.*

Development Management Practice Note 10 - Pre-Application Community Consultation recognises that the pre-application process is not a statutory requirement and is optional. However, by facilitating effective and meaningful pre-application discussions, a Council can ensure that opportunities to work collaboratively with applicants and to improve the quality of developments are maximised.

Many local planning authorities, including UK Core Cities, utilise this approach for strategic, major, and other forms of development, and charge for this service. Example charging rates by other Cities is provided in the table at Appendix 1.

### 3.2 Key Issues

Belfast is facing an unprecedented level of growth where the development pipeline includes very significant commercial and employment generating developments. The Council is committed to encouraging quality developments in the capital city of Northern Ireland.

To support applicants investing in such developments the Council needs to provide certainty and sufficient resources to ensure that planning applications for large scale, complex and other types of proposal are dealt with in a timely manner. It is therefore necessary to introduce a charging for the PAD service.

The recommended charging rate is set (copy available on the Council's Website). The charging rate has been set to recover staff and administrative costs associated with servicing a PAD. Based on the number of PADS received over the last 12 months, the Council would have received around £80,000 (excluding payments for additional meetings) had charging for PADS already been in place.

Given that this is a new and developing service, it is recommended that the Council does not charge for PADS in relation to householder developments, Listed Buildings (unless associated with a change of use), Conservation Area Consents and Advertisements. It is further recommended that there is no charge for PADS in relation to community proposals. The Duty Planner service will remain available for



members of the public who wish to discuss proposals such as domestic extensions and alterations. This is a free service.

In introducing charges for PADS, the planning service will need to provide clarity around the role of pre-application advice, how the process works and what minimum level of information required from applicants to ensure meaningful discussions.

**3.3 Next stage**

The next stage will be to informally consult on the Scale of Charging with customers, including agents, developers and landowners. It is expected that this will be done by way of a stakeholder workshop, which will discuss the Scale of Charging and Pre-Application Discussion process generally. Feedback from the workshop will be reported to the Committee, alongside draft guidance on the PAD process, so that the Committee can make a final decision on the Scale of Charging for the PAD process.

**3.5 Financial & Resource Implications**

Charging for Pre-Application Discussions is an important income stream that will support the delivery of this vital part of the planning service.

**3.6 Equality or Good Relations Implications**

None.”

The Committee agreed that the draft Scale of Charging for Pre-Application Discussions as outlined in Appendix 1 (copy available on the Council’s website), be utilised for informal consultation with stakeholders, including agents, developers and landowners.

**Supporting Community Engagement on Larger Planning Applications**

The Committee was reminded that, at its meeting of 18th October, it had agreed that the Director of Planning and Place explore the potential for the provision of independent technical support and capacity for community organisations and residents, to enable them to effectively engage and input into major physical regeneration and key capital projects in the city.

The Development Engagement Manager outlined the contents of the report and advised that Government or other agencies were best placed to provide or sponsor such support because of the need for councils (as local planning authorities) to remain impartial in the planning process and not favour one stakeholder above another.

It was understood that such support was previously provided by the Department of Environment but had been withdrawn. He advised that investigation of appropriate and independent expert support for communities would be of relevance to all communities across Northern Ireland, with potential to benefit the constituents of all eleven councils.

He confirmed that the Director of Planning and Place had therefore written to the Department of Infrastructure (DfI) to raise these issues and ask for the matter to be explored further.

Noted.

### **Listed Buildings**

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

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

After discussion, the Committee agreed with the Agency's proposals to list the following building:

- 102 – 108 Ann Street, Belfast, BT1 3HU.

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

### **Planning Applications**

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

#### **Reconsidered Item - LA04/2015/1056/F - Demolition of existing 2.5 storey house and replacement with a 3 storey apartment building at 1 Hopefield Avenue**

(Councillors Armitage, Dorrian and McAteer took no part in the discussion or decision-making of the application since they had not been in attendance at the meeting on 18th October or 15th November when it had been considered).

The Committee was reminded that, at its meeting on 15th November, given the issues which had been raised regarding the overdevelopment and design of the proposal, together with the potential impact on the townscape character of the area, it had agreed to defer consideration of the application to enable potential reasons for refusal to be outlined for consideration in an amended report at the next meeting.

The case officer advised that two possible reasons for refusal had been outlined in the report, however, the recommendation remained that the application should be approved.

### **Proposal**

Moved by Councillor Magee,  
Seconded by Councillor Garrett,

That the Committee, agrees to refuse the application based on the reasons for refusal outlined in the case officer's report:

1. The proposal is contrary to Policy QD1 of the Department's Planning Policy Statement 7: Quality Residential Environments in that the proposal fails to respect the surrounding context and is inappropriate to the character to the area by virtue of the design and appearance of the proposed building.
2. The proposal is contrary to Policy ATC2 of the Addendum to Planning Policy Statement 6 Areas of Townscape Character in that the proposed development fails to maintain or enhance the overall character or respect the built form of the Lower Cavehill Area of Townscape Character by virtue of its inappropriate design.

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

### **Further Proposal**

Moved by Councillor Hussey,  
Seconded by Councillor Mullan,

That the Committee agrees to adopt the recommendation to approve the application, subject to the imposing of the conditions set out in the case officer's report.

On a vote by show of hands, three Members voted for the proposal and two against and it was declared carried.

### **Reconsidered Item - LA04/2016/1644/F, 3 storey building, housing 5 one bed apartments with 6 parking spaces at 1 Stockmans Way**

(Councillors Armitage and McAteer took no part in the decision-making of the application since they had not been in attendance at the meeting on 15th November when it had previously been considered).

The Committee was reminded that, at its meeting on 15th November, it had deferred consideration of the application so that the Committee could undertake a site

visit in order to acquaint Members with the site and to assess the issues which had been raised regarding safety, traffic, outlook and the quality of amenity space of the proposal.

The Committee granted approval to the application, subject to the imposing of the conditions set out within the case officer's report and delegated power to the Director of Planning and Place for the addition of any required conditions in relation to air quality and noise attenuation, subject to the response being received by Environmental Health on such matters.

**Z/2015/0326/F - 23 apartments (in 3 blocks) on lands at Ormonde Gardens**

The case officer outlined an application for the erection of twenty three apartments (in 3 blocks) and all other associated site works.

Mr. T. Stokes, agent, representing the applicant, outlined a range of points in support of the proposed application which included the quality of the development, revised layout and design amendments and the current building on the site being obsolete.

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

**LA04/2015/0529/F - Construction of a drive-thru restaurant along with car parking, access and general site works at 233 - 263 Shore Road**

The Committee was apprised of the principal aspects of the application.

The case officer informed the Committee that, after the agenda had been published, additional information had been received from the agent regarding the zoning of the land for housing in the Belfast Metropolitan Area Plan (BMAP), planning history of the site, BMAP's ability to meet housing needs, and the established character and uses of the Shore Road. It outlined issues such as the current site being an eyesore, the site formed a small portion of the housing zone and would not prejudice the remainder of the site and the proposed drive-thru restaurant would be a subordinate use of the site. It was reported that the agent had also submitted plans to address the concerns regarding the use of the car park and impact on residential amenity.

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

He explained that, after assessment, it had been recommended for refusal on the grounds that:

1. The proposal was contrary to the Belfast Metropolitan Area Plan 2015 as the site was zoned for housing and, if permitted, would prejudice the delivery of housing in an area of current housing need; and
2. The proposal was contrary to the Strategic Planning Policy Statement for Northern Ireland (SPPS) and DCAN 4 in that it would, if approved, result in adverse impact on the residential amenity of occupiers of properties in Oakmount Drive during anti-social times by virtue of noise and disturbance from vehicles and customers.

The Committee received representations from Mr. D. Chick, applicant, and Mr. R. O'Toole, agent representing the applicant. Mr. O'Toole outlined a range of objections to the recommended refusal which related to the planning history, housing zone, and the lack of intent from housing associations and developers to build housing on the site. He suggested that the impact of the proposal on BMAP would be minimal, the proposal was a small percentage of the site, and the application had the potential for job creation and investment in the area. In addition, Mr. Chick explained his objections to the recommendation and suggested that the site had been in use for commercial and retail businesses for the last 80 years and it was hard to understand why this had now been taken away.

### Proposal

Moved by Councillor Hussey,  
Seconded by Councillor Magee,

Resolved - That the Committee, given the issues which had been raised regarding the zoning of the land and residential amenity, agrees to defer consideration of the application so that the amended plans which had been received could be assessed regarding residential amenity and that a reconsidered potential recommendation for an approval, in spite of it being zoned for housing in BMAP, be provided for consideration at next month's committee meeting.

### LA04/2016/0374/F - Development of 20 dwellings , car parking, security gates and footpath on lands at Brookmount Street

The Committee considered the proposed application for the development of 20 dwellings (18 two storey terrace dwellings and 2 bungalows) and associated car parking, security gates and footpath.

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

### LA04/2016/0609/O - 9 dwellings with associated site works at 10 Carncoole Park

The Committee considered the proposed application for outline planning permission for 9 dwellings with associated car parking.

The case officer explained that, after assessment, it had been recommended for refusal on the grounds that the proposal was contrary to Policy QD1 of Planning Policy Statement 7: Quality Residential Environments and Policy LC 1 of the 2nd Addendum to Planning Policy Statement 7: Safeguarding the Character of Established Residential Areas in that it would, if permitted, cause unacceptable damage to the character and residential amenity of the area through inappropriate form, layout and pattern of

development and would result in noise and nuisance to number 12 Carncoole Park through increased traffic movements.

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

**LA04/2016/1488/F - 6 apartments at 25 Malone Road**

(Councillor Dorrian had left the room whilst the item was under consideration).

The Committee considered an application for the demolition of 3 existing apartments and the erection of 6 apartments.

The case officer highlighted that, although the proposal removed an existing town house within the Malone Conservation Area, the principle of the development was established under planning permission Z/2011/1225/F (approved 3/1/2015 and remained extant until 3/1/2018).

On a vote by show of hands, 3 Members voted in favour of adopting the recommendation to approve the application, with 2 voting against, and it was declared carried.

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

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

**LA04/2016/2045/F - Alterations to ground floor lobby of Oyster House, extension and alteration to floors one to seven to rear of Oyster House and Royston House and alterations to elevations on Upper Queen Street and Wellington Place Lands at 12 - 30 Wellington Place (Oyster House) and 42-46 Upper Queen Street (Royston House)**

The Committee was apprised of the principal aspects of the application.

It was reported that the site was located within the development limits of Belfast in the Belfast Metropolitan Area Plan 2015 and was identified as being within the Belfast City Centre Conservation Area.

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

**Z/2014/0260/F - 6 detached dwellings with associated car-parking, garages, landscaping, site and access works with conversion and alterations of existing listed building to single dwelling on lands located to the south of 1 - 7 Glenmachan Park and adjoining Glenmachan Road**

(Councillor McAteer had left the room whilst the item was under consideration).

The case officer highlighted that this was a revised scheme comprising of a conversion of the existing listed building to a single dwelling and 6 detached dwellings within the grounds.

The Committee approved the application, subject to the imposing of the conditions set out in the case officer's report and, in accordance with Section 76 of the

Planning Act (Northern Ireland) 2015, delegated power to the Director of Planning and Place, in conjunction with the City Solicitor, to enter into discussions with the applicant to explore the scope of any Planning Agreements which might be realised by way of developer contributions and, if so, to enter into such an Agreement on behalf of the Council.

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

**LA04/2016/1540/RM - Roundabout, works at M3 slip lane and reconfiguration and upgrade of Sydenham Road/Queen's Quay at Queen's Quay (lands between M3 and Odyssey building)**

The case officer outlined a Reserved Matters (RM) application which sought permission for the essential infrastructure consisting of the construction of a new roundabout, works at the M3 slip lane and the reconfiguration and upgrade of Sydenham Road/Queen's Quay in association with a major mixed use development for residential (798 units), hotels (x2), offices (c. 5000sqm), leisure and community uses (c3,000 sqm), cafes, bars and restaurants (c3,000sqm), a multi storey car park (c 55,000sqm) and an ancillary development which had been granted outline approval in December, 2013.

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

**LA04/2016/2093/A - 2 signs to the east elevation of 9 - 21 Adelaide Street comprising of building name and council logo**

(Councillor Magee had left the room whilst the item was under consideration).

With permission of the Chairperson, the Director tabled an application report for advertising consent for the erection of two signs to the east elevation of 9 - 21 Adelaide Street comprising the building name and Belfast City Council logo.

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

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

**LA04/2016/1825/F - Woodland Outdoor classroom and play area at Shore Road**

The case officer outlined an application for a new woodland play facility and outdoor classroom at lands to the rear of St. Marys Nursery.

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

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

**LA04/2016/2170/F - 2 storey rear extension and single storey porch to front at 3 Strathmore Park South**

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

The Committee considered an application to construct a two storey rear extension and a single storey front porch to an existing detached dwelling.

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

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

**LA04/2016/0460/F- Conversion of existing building to 6 one bed residential apartments with alterations to facades and structural repair / alteration of rear extension at 164 - 166 Ravenhill Road**

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

The Committee was apprised of the principal aspects of the application.

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

**LA04/2016/0867/F - Conversion of existing building to 6 apartments including landscaping and replacement UPVC windows at 195 Templemore Avenue**

The Committee considered the proposed application.

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

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

**LA04/2016/1419/F - Park and Ride at Blacks Road**

The case officer outlined an application for 307 additional spaces to the existing car park as well as LED street lighting at reduced heights. She advised that the site was located adjacent to the existing park and ride car park on Black's Road.



After discussion, given the issues which had been raised regarding residential parking, the connectivity between areas and transport hubs, active travel, and links to the local development plan, the Committee agreed to defer consideration of the application to enable the applicant, the Department for Infrastructure, to respond formally to the issues which had been raised, to ensure connectivity for the future of the Local Development Plan.

**LA04/2015/1532/F - Change of Use to Hot Food takeaway with flue, Shankill Road**

The Committee considered an application for the change of use from a furniture shop to hot food bar (Sui Generis).

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

Chairperson