

# Planning Committee

Tuesday, 19th September, 2017

## MEETING OF PLANNING COMMITTEE

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

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

### **Apologies**

No apologies were reported.

### **Minutes**

The minutes of the meeting of 15th August were taken as read and signed as correct. It was reported that those minutes had been adopted by the Council at its meeting on 4th September, subject to the omission of those matters in respect of which the Council had delegated its powers to the Committee.

### **Declarations of Interest**

Regarding item 8.d) LA04/2017/0623/F and LA04/2017/0628/DCA Single storey rear extension, rear dormer and first floor extension to rear and first floor front extension at 10 Broomhill Park, Councillor McDonough-Brown declared an interest, in so far as he had submitted an objection to the proposal.

### **Committee Site Visits**

Pursuant to its decision of 15th August, it was noted that the Committee had undertaken a site visit on 31st August in respect of planning applications LA04/2016/0400/F - Apartment development (28 units) on lands at 230 Belmont Road and LA04/2015/0670/F - Residential development of 53 units comprising 33 detached, 4 semi-detached and 16 apartments on lands at Castlehill Manor, Castlehill Road.

The Committee also noted that the detailed input by Transport NI at the Belmont Road site visit had been helpful and appreciated.

### **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 8th August and 8th September, 2017.

### **Departmental Performance Update**

The Committee noted that up to date statutory performance figures had not been received from the Department for Infrastructure (DfI) and agreed that if an update was received from DfI before the next Planning Committee, it would be circulated to the Members of the Committee.

### **Abandonments and Extinguishments of Public Rights of Way**

With the permission of the Chairperson, the Democratic Services Officer tabled correspondence from the Department for Infrastructure which related to an abandonment order at the Glenwood Green, Dunmurry and the Committee noted the contents of the letter.

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

- Lawther Court;
- Mountpottinger Way;
- Annalee Court;
- Hopewell Crescent; and
- Bandon Court.

### **Miscellaneous Items**

#### **Presentation by Historic Environment Division on Listed Buildings**

The Chairperson welcomed Mr. G. Sloan, Assistant Director, Historic Environment Division from the Department for Communities Heritage Buildings Designation Branch.

Mr. Sloan provided a brief overview of the purpose of the Historic Environment Division (HED) and advised that the listing of buildings was underpinned by legislation. He informed the Committee that address information of all listed buildings could be found in the Northern Ireland Buildings Database on the HED website together with detailed descriptions and evaluations of all buildings listed and unlisted, which had been surveyed in detail since 1997.

He highlighted that Section 80(7) of the 2011 Planning Act stated:

- *'In this Act "listed building" meant that a building which was, for the time being, included in a list compiled under this section; and, for the purposes of the provisions of this Act related to listed buildings, the following should be treated as part of the building:*
  - *any object or structure within the curtilage of the building and fixed to the building; and*
  - *any object or structure within the curtilage of the building which, although not fixed to the building, formed part of the*  
*land and had done so since before 1st October, 1973.'*

He advised that the First Survey of Listed Buildings had been undertaken from 1969 to 1995 and the Second Survey had commenced in 1997. He informed the Committee that the Second Survey was more comprehensive and included detailed records, both written and photographic, and also compiled historical research. He pointed out that its decisions were based upon clearly established criteria and that the process was as follows:

- A desktop exercise using historic maps etc. to identify potential listings;
- On-the-ground scoping survey of an area;
- Initial group evaluation to establish the need for a survey;
- Survey and record;
- Group evaluation to determine proposed listing;
- Statutory consultation with the Historical Buildings Council (HBC) and appropriate local council;
- Evaluation of responses and representations; and
- Director sign-off.

He advised that clarification of the Department's interpretation of the legislative criteria was set out in detail in Annex C of Planning Policy Statement 6 (PPS 6) and explained how the Department interpreted the legislative criteria of: Architectural Interest; Historic Interest; Group Value; and Features and Structures. He pointed out that standards were established under the following grading system:

- Grade A - Buildings of national importance including both outstanding grand buildings and the fine, little altered examples of some important style or date;
- Grade B+ - High quality buildings that because of exceptional features, interiors or environmental qualities were clearly above the general standard set by grade B1 buildings. Also, buildings which might have merited Grade A status but for detracting features such as an incomplete design, lower quality additions or alterations;
- Grade B1 - good examples of a particular period or style. A degree of alteration or imperfection of design might be acceptable. Generally B1 – buildings that qualify for listing by virtue of a relatively wide selection of attributes; and
- Grade B2 - buildings which meet the test of the legislation, but exhibit a degree of alteration or imperfection of design.

He also provided an overview of the statutory engagement in the listing process as follows:

- Statutory consultations were made to the Historic Buildings Council (HBC) and the local council;
- The council and HBC are given an overview at the commencement of a new area survey;
- HBC receives a full evaluation report of each record in advance of its (monthly) meeting;
- A presentation, including exterior and interior images, of each proposed listing or delisting is made at the HBC meeting;
- HBC discusses and votes on each proposed listing;
- At the same time as the HBC, the local council is given a six-week consultation period;
- Council and HBC advice (which should be based on the listing criteria) does not determine grading;
- HED considers the local council, HBC and other representations;
- Recommendation would be made to the Director;
- Director might agree, disagree or seek further information on the recommendation; and
- Council and HBC are informed of the final outcome.

During discussion, Members were apprised of further information regarding the potential of grants for maintenance of listed buildings, listed building consent, the rights of owners of listed buildings, right of access (statutory provision), the weight of the Council's opinion and the anticipated time period for completion of the Second Survey.

After discussion, the Chairperson thanked Mr. Sloan for attending and the Committee noted the information which had been provided.

(Councillor Bunting entered the Committee meeting at this point.)

### **Proposed Listed Buildings**

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

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

The Committee was also reminded that, at its meeting on 15th August, it had agreed to defer consideration of the listing of 30 Malone Park so that further clarification could be sought from the Historic Environment Division regarding the process that had been undertaken to list the property.

The Committee received a deputation from Dr. B. Austin, resident of 30 Malone Park, in objection to the Listing of the Building. He suggested that he had received unfair treatment from the Heritage Buildings Designation Branch (HBDB) and he was concerned with the criteria and listing process. He suggested that his home was 'ordinary' when compared to the other buildings in Malone Park and would contend that the conditions for B2 Listings were not applicable to his

property. He suggested that he felt threatened by the correspondence from the HBDB, and that as his property was not gated, access had been easily gained by the surveyors and his house had been an opportunistic target.

During points of clarification, Dr. Austin suggested that there had been an invasion of privacy, listing his residence would cause additional maintenance costs, make his property a more onerous burden, and possibly effect internal works that might be required in the near future for his disabled wife.

Mr. Sloan clarified that 30 Malone Park had not been singled out to be listed. He suggested that although correspondence to Dr. Austin had stated the statutory legislation, it was made clear that access would be sought by agreement and that they had no wish to pressure him for access at present. He also confirmed that Conservation Area protection was treated separately from the Listing of Building protection and pointed out that the Listing of a Building did not preclude alteration or demolition of a building, but such requests would be deliberated via the Planning Process.

During discussion, the Director highlighted that the listing of buildings process was based on a criteria and personal circumstances of occupiers were not material to the listing of a building. He reiterated that alterations or amendments to a listed building could still take place, subject to planning policy.

The Committee was advised that correspondence had also been received from the Northern Ireland Environment Agency (NIEA) seeking the Council's views in respect of proposals for the listing of 56 – 164 North Street, and 166 – 174 North Street.

After discussion, the Committee rejected the proposed listing of 30 Malone Park as it did not meet the criteria for listing and supported the proposed listings of the following buildings by the Department for Communities:

- 156 – 164 North Street, Belfast, BT1 1LF; and
- 166 – 174 North Street, Belfast, BT1 1QS.

#### **Article 4 Direction**

(Councillors Garrett, Hussey and Magee had left the room whilst the item was under consideration.)

The Committee was reminded that it had previously agreed to the undertake a public consultation exercise in order to ascertain the level of support for Article 4 Directions to be issued within Adelaide Park and Malone Park Conservation Areas. The directions would enable the Council to restrict permitted development rights associated with householder development that could currently be undertaken without the need for planning permission and it was agreed that, should sufficient support be demonstrated for the proposal, Article 4 Directions would be issued.

It was reported that a survey was carried out in July to ascertain the level of support for Article 4 Directions and a previous consultation had also been carried out in 2016. This second consultation was considered to be necessary due to an error made in

the first consultation in that information on the associated fee of £64 should have been included.

An overview of the recent public consultation was provided and it was reported that the results demonstrated that a majority of residents had supported the introduction of Article 4 Directions within Adelaide Park and Malone Park Conservation Areas. Therefore, it had been recommended to serve Notice of Article 4 Directions in both areas to cover the following points:

- Replacing window frames and doors to front elevations and side elevations;
- Painting the exterior of houses;
- The creation of porches to external doors;
- The erection of gates, fences, walls or other means of enclosure within the curtilage of a property. This would apply anywhere within the curtilage of the property in the case of Adelaide Park and from the front building line of the property to the front boundary in the case of Malone Park; and
- The creation of hardstanding to front lawns.

The Committee agreed to serve Notice of Article 4 Directions in Adelaide Park and Malone Park Conservation Areas restricting some of the householder permitted development rights as outlined and noted that these Directions would require the approval of the Department for Infrastructure prior to final implementation.

(Councillors Carson, Garrett, Hussey and Magee returned to the Committee table at this point.)

### **Withdrawn Items**

The Committee noted that item 3. - The response to consultation requests from Department for Infrastructure – Transport Hub, and item 9. i) LA04/2017/1008/F and LA04/2017/1010/LBC - Demolition of single storey rear extension and partially 2 storey rear extension with internal alterations and the erection of 2 storey rear extension and bin/cycle store at 12 Upper Crescent had been withdrawn from the agenda.

### **Additional Item – Operation of the Planning Committee**

(Councillors Bunting, Hussey and McDonough-Brown had left the room whilst the item was under consideration.)

With the permission of the Chairperson, Alderman McGimpsey questioned the allegations of sectarian voting during the consideration of Planning Applications by the Planning Committee which had been made by Councillor Magee at the Council Meeting on 4th September.

Councillor Magee advised that the comments he had made at the Council meeting had not implied that any of the planning staff were sectarian and that further discussion was required on the assertions that had been made at the Council meeting.

The Chairperson stated that the Committee meeting was not the correct forum for this discussion and called the debate to a close.

(Councillors Bunting, Hussey and McDonough-Brown 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 - LA04/2016/0400/F Apartment development (28 units) on lands at 230 Belmont Road**

(Councillor McDonough-Brown had left the room whilst the item was under consideration.)

The Committee was reminded that, at its meeting on 15th August, given the issues which had been raised regarding the traffic and impact on the trees, it had agreed to defer consideration of the application to enable a site visit to be undertaken to allow the Committee to acquaint itself with the location and the proposal at first hand and that the Committee also had agreed that the Council's Tree Officer be invited to attend the site visit and Transport NI asked for clarification on their position and attend the next Planning Committee, if possible.

The case officer provided an overview of the report and highlighted that a site visit had taken place on 31st August, at which the Council's Tree Officer and a representative from the Department for Infrastructure had been in attendance and answered a range of queries.

During discussion, one Member requested that an additional condition be included in the approval regarding child safety signage at the site.

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.

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

The Committee was reminded that, at its meeting on 15th August, given the issues which had been raised regarding access and drainage at the site, it had been agreed to defer consideration of the application to enable a site visit to be undertaken to allow the Committee to acquaint itself with the location and the proposal at first hand.

The case officer informed the Committee that, after the agenda had been published, an additional objection had been received from Mr. R. Tunnicliffe (Party Secretary, Green Party), which suggested the following points:

- Lack of Environmental Impact Assessment;
- Impact on protected species (bats) – Bat Survey might be required;
- Lack of Adequate Community Consultation;
- Query in relation to recommended condition by Rivers Agency;
- Query in relation to gardens of dwellings being within floodplain; and
- Questioned why no ground condition survey had been submitted given the risk of flooding and subsidence within area.

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

The Committee received a representation from Mr. R. Tunnicliffe, representing the Green Party. He outlined a range of objections to the case officer's recommendation for approval which included residents' concerns, the lack of environmental impact assessment determination, designation of the site under BMAP as a site of local conservation importance and the potential of a legal challenge if the proposal was approved. He suggested that a deferral would be appropriate so that the issue of subsidence could be addressed.

During discussion, the case officer reiterated that a scoping determination exercise had been completed and that an environmental statement was not required. He highlighted that adequate geotechnical solutions for foundations and associated structures were subject to separate legislative control and it was a matter for the developer to secure an appropriate engineering solution.

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

**Reconsidered Item - LA04/2016/0487/F - Change of use from dwelling to a coffee shop at ground floor and first floor store and a single storey side and rear extension at 1 St. Agnes Drive.**

(Alderman McGimpsey and Councillors Bunting and Carson took no part in the discussion or decision-making of the application since they had not been in attendance at the meeting on 20th June when it had originally been considered).

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



The Committee was reminded that, at its meeting on 20th June, given the issues which had been raised regarding car parking and the impact on residential amenity, it had agreed to defer consideration of the application in order to undertake a site visit to allow the Committee to acquaint itself with the location and the proposal at first hand.

The case officer pointed out that, at its meeting on 20th June, the Committee had received a case officer's report with a recommendation to approve the proposal (copy available [here](#)) and since then, further objections had been received from residents regarding car parking and anti-social behaviour. She advised that reassessment of the proposal had taken place and had taken account of the issues which had been raised by objectors and by Members of the Planning Committee.

She highlighted that having re-assessed the impact on neighbouring residents, as outlined in the report, it was recommended that the application was refused for the following reasons:

1. The proposal was contrary to the Strategic Planning Policy Statement for Northern Ireland (SPPS) and Development Control Advice Note 4 'Restaurants, Cafes and Fast Food Outlets' in that the use would, if permitted, harm the living conditions of neighbouring residential properties through odours, noise, nuisance, and general disturbance resulting in a detrimental impact on residential amenity;
2. The proposal was contrary to the Strategic Planning Policy Statement for Northern Ireland in that, if permitted, would create conflict with adjacent land uses in respect of over dominance, loss of light, and overshadowing; and
3. The proposal was contrary to the Strategic Planning Policy Statement for Northern Ireland, in that it would, if permitted, cause unacceptable damage to the character of the area due to the uncharacteristic design, scale and mass of the proposal.

The Committee received representations from Mrs. C. Webb and Mr. J. Webb. They outlined a range of objections to the proposal which included the impact on parking, the lack of consultation by the developer, the scale of the building, and the impact the proposal would have on residents and their family life.

The Committee received representation from Mr. P. Morgan, agent, representing the applicant. He indicated that he was concerned that residents had spoken with Councillors who had attended the site visit and questioned the procedure of site visits. He raised concerns regarding the reversal of the case officer's recommendation and suggested that the overshadowing which had been outlined in the report was not an issue as the height of the proposal was not excessive. He pointed out that an acoustic study had been carried out which detailed construction measures to protect the residential amenity of the neighbouring property and questioned why no explanation had been given by the Planning Department to the change in opinion of this issue. He highlighted that Environmental Health had no objection to the proposal and odour emissions measures had also been agreed. He clarified that the application was for a coffee shop not for a hot-food takeaway, and suggested that food odours would be

minimal. He questioned why the reasons for refusal had been acceptable in the initial case officer's report but had now been reversed by the Planning Department. He stated that he had attempted to contact the Planning Office regarding the change in recommendation but had not been given the opportunity to respond. He suggested that the building had a history of commercial consent and had been vacant for 10 - 12 years. He suggested that the acoustic report carried out at the property had referenced a noise level of 61 Db, therefore, the site was not suitable for residential use. He also stated that Transport NI did not have any objection to the proposal.

The Divisional Solicitor reminded the Committee that the operating protocol was clear, in that Members of the Committee were not allowed to engage with applicants and objectors at site visits. She advised Members that if there had been engagement with members of the public at the site visit, then they should not take part in determining the outcome of the application. The planning officer also advised that, at the site visit, it was made clear to residents of the purpose of the site visit and it had been explained that applicants or objectors could not take part or enter into discussion with the Members present.

During discussion, one Member questioned how the change in the case officer's recommendation had been arrived at. The case officer advised that, after issues had been raised by the Committee and objectors at the Committee in June, further consideration had been given to the potential conditions of the approval to assess if they would be reasonable, measurable and enforceable. She advised that the outcome of the review had raised significant impact to the neighbouring properties and that the previous conditions would have been very difficult to meet. The Director clarified that the officers had listened to the debate, benefited from the subsequent site visit, and considered it appropriate to alter the recommendation to refusal.

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

(Alderman McGimpsey, Councillors Carson and Dorrian returned to the Committee table at this point.)

**LA04/2017/0623/F and LA04/2017/0628/DCA - Single storey rear extension, rear dormer and first floor extension to rear and a first floor front extension at 10 Broomhill Park**

(Councillor McDonough-Brown, 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.)

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

The case officer informed the Committee that, after the agenda had been published, the following points of objection had been received from the Ulster Architectural Heritage Society:

- First floor front extension above the garage was not subordinate to the main building. The proposed extension was in conflict with the 'Design and Development Guidance' set out in the Design Guide 5.2.32 '*an extension should be subordinate to the main building in terms of form and massing*';

- In addition, Section 5.2.47 of the guide stated that *'it would not be appropriate to add another storey to an original single storey attached garage at an Inter War residence'*;
- The proposed extension failed to meet the Design Guide's criteria, and would greatly impact the massing of the building frontage where no such precedent was evident in the Broomhill locale, either for front elevation extensions or first floor extensions above garages;
- The roof profile and roof silhouette both at the front and rear were also subject to alteration with the proposed extensions where the Design Guide clearly stated in Section 5.2.14 that *'original roof profiles should be retained.'*;
- The proposed alterations to the rear of the property, particularly the insertion of dormers on the roof to the rear would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the conservation area (PPS 6 Section 7.8). The choice of materials was not sympathetic to the character and style of the Inter War period property;
- Regarding the proposed sunroom to the rear of the building, UAHS did not feel that this addition if considered alone was to the detriment of the building, however, when viewed alongside the proposed dormers and small rear extensions to the rear the character of the building would undoubtedly be comprised;
- The proposal was not appropriate in the context of Malone Conservation Area and was in conflict with Article 50 (5) of the Planning (NI) Order 1991 which required that *'where any area for the time being designated as a conservation area special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing its character of appearance.'*

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

The Committee received representation from Councillor Craig who outlined a range of objections to the case officer's recommendation for approval. He suggested that the conservation area should be maintained and the proposal did not fit the design criteria. He also suggested that there was the potential for the Planning Department to reconsider and change the recommendation to refusal and that a site visit would be beneficial.

The Committee received a representation from Mr. B. Johnston in objection to the application. He suggested that the proposal was in breach of Malone Conservation

Area Guidelines, the gable wall would alter the three dimensional form of the building, destroy the form and symmetry of the building and would have a detrimental affect on the neighbouring property. He suggested that there would be loss of light, loss of amenity, and that the proposal was contrary to PPS 7. He suggested that the extension was obtrusive, dominant and an encroachment of space.

During points of clarification, the case officer confirmed that an angle test had been carried out as part of the assessment of the application and Mr. Johnston confirmed that access to his property had not been requested by the Planning Department.

The Committee received representation from Mr. D. Maxwell, representing the applicant. He outlined his support for the proposal and suggested how it complied with the Malone Conservation Area Guidelines. In relation to the objector's comments, he pointed out that revised drawings had been submitted regarding the front extension, which had now been pushed back beyond the front façade so that the extension was subordinate to the main building. He suggested that the proposed materials would match the main house and that the design of the roof dormer had also been scaled down. He suggested that the design was in character with the area, subordinate to the main building, and consistent with all policies and design guides.

During points of clarification, the case officer advised that, on balance, given the size of the proposal and the existing separation distances between the properties, it was considered that the proposal would not cause unacceptable impact to the surrounding amenities. The conservation officer advised that, as there was a built form already in existence above the garage, the marginal increase proposed did not compromise the objective of the conservation area guidance.

### **Proposal**

Moved by Councillor Carson, and  
Seconded by Councillor Garrett,

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

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

### **Further Proposal**

Moved by Councillor Hussey, and  
Seconded by Councillor Dorrian,

That the Committee, given the issues which had been raised regarding the first floor front extension not complying with the Malone Conservation Area Guidelines, agrees 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.

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

(Councillor McDonough-Brown returned to the Committee table at this point.)

**LA04/2016/2205/F - Erection of two storey dwelling (revised scheme), west and to the rear of 2 Knockdarragh Park**

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

The case officer outlined the proposal for the site which was within the development limits for Belfast and was unzoned whiteland in the draft Belfast Metropolitan Plan.

The Committee received a representation from Mr. M. Smyrl in objection to the application. He suggested that the proposal had fundamental errors and that it should be withdrawn from the agenda. He pointed out that the case officer had not visited his property and suggested that a site visit to access his property to assess the impact would be beneficial. He suggested that the variation of floor levels had not been reported and that the plot depth fell short of the recommended 80m which would create an unsatisfactory relationship with his property. He suggested that the front to back layout would be an invasion of his privacy and cause a detrimental impact on his home. He suggested that the minimum standard of separation distance between neighbouring properties had also not been met. He also suggested that the proposal was out of keeping with the character of the area and the density of the proposal would result in an increase of over 40% of to the size of the building which would be an unacceptable overdevelopment.

The Committee received a representation from Mr. C. Markwell, representing the applicant, who outlined his support to the proposal which included the history of planning approval on the site and that planning policies had remained the same since those approvals. He indicated that the applicant had amended the design after objections had been submitted, which resulted in a reduction to the height and scale from the original proposal. He suggested that the design was in character with the area, compliant with DECAN 8 and the Supplementary Planning Guidance - Creating Places. He suggested also that the orientation of the proposal would prevent overlooking into the neighbouring property and there would be no loss of light. He pointed out that the design included in-curtilage car parking provision for 3 vehicles.

The Committee agreed to defer consideration of the application to enable a site visit to be undertaken to allow the Committee to acquaint itself with the location and the proposal at first hand.

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

**LA04/2016/2196/F - Demolition of existing buildings and erection of a Primary School with associated Multi-Use Games Area, car parking, landscaping and associated site works at St Patricks Primary School, 9-25 Pim Street**

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

The Committee considered the aforementioned application which would replace the two existing school buildings and would consolidate the facility on one site as opposed to two. It was reported that 616 pupils and 84 staff members would be accommodated within the new building.

During discussion, the case officer advised that details of an amended layout for Traffic and Parking had been submitted by the applicant and Transport NI had been consulted on 6th September 2017, however, a response remained outstanding. He pointed out that the provision of in-curtilage drop-off parking should reduce the numbers of street drop offs on Churchill Street and a total of 85 car parking spaces had been proposed, which would provide an increase of 53 parking spaces.

The Director advised that a Traffic Management Plan could not be added as a condition to the approval, however, it could be addressed as an informative on the approval should the committee so decide.

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 and the aforementioned informative.

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

**LA04/2017/0986/F - Change of use from a single dwelling to house of multiple occupancy (HMO) at 10 Ardenlee Green**

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

The case officer advised that records had indicated that this would be the first and only HMO to date in Ardenlee Green and was therefore acceptable in principle.

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

**LA04/2017/1609/F - Change of use from a residential to a house of multiple occupancy (HMO) at 5 Cricklewood Crescent**

The case officer advised that records had indicated that this would be the first and only HMO to date in Cricklewood Crescent and was therefore acceptable in principle.

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

Chairperson