

East Belfast Area Working Group

Tuesday, 31st May, 2022

MEETING OF EAST BELFAST AREA WORKING GROUP HELD REMOTELY VIA MICROSOFT TEAMS

Members present: Alderman Sandford (Chairperson),
The Lord Mayor (Councillor Long);
The Deputy Lord Mayor (Alderman Haire);
Aldermen Copeland, Dorrian and Rodgers; and
Councillors de Faoite, Flynn, Hanvey, Howard,
M. Kelly, Kyle, Maghie, Newton and Smyth.

In attendance: Ms. S. Grimes, Director of Physical Programmes;
Ms. R. Crozier, Interim Director of Neighbourhood Services;
Mr. S. Leonard, Neighbourhood Services Manager;
Ms. K. Gilliland, Neighbourhood Services Manager;
Mrs. L. McLornan, Democratic Services Officer; and
Mrs. V. Smyth, Democratic Services Officer.

Apologies

An apology for inability to attend was reported from Councillor McMullan.

Minutes

The Working Group agreed that the minutes of the meeting of 3rd March were an accurate record of proceedings.

Declarations of Interest

Councillor Newton declared an interest in Item 7b, Request to present from Ulster Rugby, in that the company that he worked for provided funding to Ulster Rugby and he retired from the meeting and did not participate in the discussion on that item.

Councillor Kyle declared an interest in respect of Item 2 – Update on the Physical Programme, in that he was a Board Member of the Lagan Village Youth and Community Association. However, as the funding in respect of that group was not discussed, he did not need to leave the meeting.

Alderman Rodgers also declared an interest in respect of Item 2 – Update on the Physical Programme, in that he was a Board Member of Glentoran Football Club. However, as the issue raised was for a separate entity, namely, Glentoran Academy, he did not need to leave the meeting.

Update on the Physical Programme - Verbal update

The Director of Physical Programmes provided the Working Group with a number of updates on current projects including the Lisnasharragh Community Schools project where she confirmed that work on Cregagh Primary School was due for completion in July. She

updated that works on the Braniel Church project were due to commence the following week and that, in relation to the Lagan Village Youth and Community Centre, all of the outstanding land issues had been resolved and that confirmation in respect of a funding application was awaited. She confirmed that a further update would be brought back to a future Working Group meeting.

She reminded the Working Group that it had previously agreed to undertake site visits and recommended that the above projects be part of a future site visit.

A Member requested that an update be provided to the next meeting in respect of the Castlereagh Presbyterian Church project.

The Director of Physical Programmes advised the Working Group that, as the Westbourne Presbyterian Church/Titanic People project was no longer viable, £230,009 of LIF funding remained to be allocated. A discussion took place in respect of the reallocation of funds.

Moved by Alderman Dorrian,
Seconded by the Lord Mayor (Councillor Long) and

Resolved – that the £230,009 of the Local Investment Fund (LIF) be reallocated as follows:

- £70,000 to Cycling Ireland towards the Henry Jones BMX/cycle track project;
- £70,000 to the Cregagh Sports Club;
- £30,000 to provide storage facilities for Bloomfield Football Club, Clonduff Football Club, East Belfast Football Club and Glentoran Academy; and
- that the remainder of the funding be ringfenced for the Bloomfield Community Association.

In response to a request from the Director of Physical Programmes, the Working Group further agreed that officers should engage with the Department for Communities in relation to seek matching partner funding for the Lagan Village Youth and Community Association, given that it owned the premises.

Update on PEACEPLUS: including a presentation from SEUPB appointed consultants, Blu Zebra and Locus Management

(Ms. N. Lane, Good Relations Manager attended in connection with this item)

The Good Relations Manager provided the Working Group with an overview of the emerging development of the overall PEACEPLUS programme. She highlighted the need for external resource to support the Co-Designed Local Community PEACE Action Plan which had already been presented to the Strategic Policy and Resources Committee.

The Chairperson welcomed to the meeting Mr. C. Boylan of Locus Management, and Ms. T. Hogg of Blu Zebra, representing the SEUPB appointed consultants, who were currently supporting the Council to develop its approach to submitting a plan for a Local Community PEACE Action Plan for Belfast.

Mr. Boylan provided the Members with an overview of the PEACE PLUS Programme and the €1.14bn investment in the social, economic and environmental development of

Northern Ireland and the border counties of Ireland. He outlined that the Programme comprised six themes and encompassed 21 individual investment areas of which Investment Area 1.1 Co-designed Local Community PEACEPLUS Action Plans had been allocated €110m. He provided further details of the programme timeframe and reassured the Members that Section 75 groups and geographical community engagement would be a key focus whilst shaping the design of the new Peace Plus Programme. He then proceeded to provide the Working Group with further information in relation to the Local Authority PEACE PLUS Action Model and the 4 pillars contained within the Governance structure.

The Members were advised that the design work would be being progressed through the Council's Shared City Partnership and noted that officers would be organising area information sessions with the consultant's consortium to update stakeholders on the emerging work with regards to PEACEPLUS Local Community PEACE Action Plans.

The Chairperson thanked the representatives for their informative presentation and they retired from the meeting.

Alleygates - Verbal update

The Neighbourhood Services Manager drew the Members' attention to two reference lists that had been compiled and circulated with the agenda in respect of alleygate requests. He advised that, at this stage, those were indicative lists. He reported that the South, North and West Area Working Groups had all agreed to convene a workshop for their respective Groups to enable them to consider the numerous alleygate requests in more detail which would allow for any queries that the Members might have to be addressed before progressing towards making the final selection.

A Member requested that information be provided to the Members, at the workshop, highlighting areas whereby a small number of streets were currently left ungated and where gating the remaining streets would complete an entire area. He raised Jocelyn Street as an example.

In response to a further Member's query regarding the positive use of alleyways by communities, the Neighbourhood Services Manager explained that he would be meeting representatives from the Department for Communities on 8th June in relation to progressing the Alleyway Transformation Programme.

It was agreed that the Neighbourhood Services Manager would liaise with the Democratic Services Officer to identify a suitable date to convene a workshop within the next few weeks to progress towards the final selection of the alleygates.

Cherryvale Gate Update

The Working Group considered the undernoted report:

“1.0 Purpose of Report or Summary of main Issues

1.1 The purpose of the report is:

- **update members on the findings of the Cherryvale gate anti-social behaviour measures survey**
- **to present options as to next steps for members to consider**

2.0 Recommendations

2.1 The Working Group is asked to:

- Note the results of the ASB measure survey residents' survey.
- Note the request by residents interviewed for a meeting with either the elected members of Lisnasharragh DEA or members of the P&C committee.
- Consider options and agree next steps.

3.0 Main report

3.1 Following a request at People and Communities Committee on 3rd March 2020, the Committee agreed to commence a consultation process with immediate neighbours and other stakeholders regarding the potential re-opening of an entrance gate into Cherryvale Playing Fields from Knockbreda Park.

3.2 At the People and Communities Committee meeting on 11 August 2020, officers were asked to arrange a site meeting to allow Elected Members the opportunity to meet with various user groups to discuss any relevant issues regarding the Playing Fields. A site meeting was held on the 3rd September 2020 and involved Elected Members, representatives from Friends of Cherryvale and various sports users of the facility. Belfast City Council Officers provided an update on works that were taking place within the Playing Fields. Officers also provided an update that 100 households within the immediate vicinity of the gate had been sent a questionnaire asking for their views concerning the potential re-opening of the gate.

3.3 At a further People and Communities Committee meeting, on 8th September 2020, officers were asked to widen the survey to incorporate additional residents. Following discussion, it was subsequently decided to extend the survey scope to a 400 metre radius (i.e. approximately within a 5 minute walk) from the gate.

The Committee, in reviewing the findings, asked that in an attempt to address the anti-social behaviour concerns, that an assessment be carried out in consultation with adjacent residents who might be affected on the possible options to prevent anti-social behaviour including new lighting options, anti-graffiti paint and anti-climb paint.

To complete this survey, Belfast City Council officers determined that 61 properties would need to be consulted in which residents who may be affected by any such anti-social behaviour issues would live. The residents identified live in the following properties;

Address	Property numbers
Knock Eden Pk	1 to 17 odd and even side
Rosetta Pk	16-36 odd and even side.
Knockbreda Rd	24 - 55 odd and even side.

- 3.4** Belfast City Council received a total of 18 responses from residents who received letters requesting they be engaged with in person to discuss the potential reopening of the gate and to detail any concerns they may have.

The respondents who had requested interviews which were scheduled for Wednesday 26th May failed to respond to any further correspondence or communication with the Open Spaces and Street Scene Manager. Interviews with the remaining 15 respondents were conducted over three scheduled days via face to face engagement or via Microsoft Teams. The respondents were asked to complete a semi structured interview with set questions and an opportunity to elaborate and detail further concerns they have during and after the questionnaire was completed. The results of the fixed questions are as attached in Appendix A on mod.gov.

- 3.5** Key findings include:

- 60% of residents surveyed are not in favour of opening the gate. 40% are in favour of reopening. (Note that overall, 89% of respondents to the wider consultation were in favour of reopening).
- 67% of those surveyed either agreed or strongly agreed that the reopening of the gate will increase the instances of anti-social behaviour in the area.
- Of the three measures proposed to prevent ASB higher fencing was the most popular, although the majority of those interviewed either disagreed or strongly disagreed that the proposed measures would have any effect on reducing the likelihood of ASB.

- 3.6** During the course of the interviews, a number of measures were requested if a decision to open the gate was made. The measures detailed are as follows:

- 3.7**

- The gate to be 12 foot in height in order to prevent youths entering the park during such times the park is closed.
- Meaningful control measures to prevent dogs running freely and fouling within the park indiscriminately.
- The erection of extensive two-meter security fencing at the rear of the properties in Rosetta Park to protect their private property from intrusion from people and dogs as well as potential crime.
- Installation of surveillance cameras (CCTV) in order to closely monitor and deter anti-social behaviour and potential crime.
- The erection of higher fencing around the substation to prevent youths congregating within the substation.
- The reduction of foliage and tree coverings within the area inside the gate in order to increase light and to discourage anti-social behaviour.

- Potentially installation of a lightening system to provide light within the area of access the reopening of the gate will allow as a means of security and prevention of anti-social behaviour.
- Increase dog poo bins if the gate is reopened to facilitate the increase in dog walkers within the area and access the park via Knockbreda Road.
- Kissing Gate to be installed if the decision is made to reopen the gate, this would prevent fast and speedy exit from the park from both an anti-social behaviour perspective and a child safety perspective.

3.8 If such measures detailed above were implemented in order to manage anti-social behaviour concerns, the costs would be as follows –

- Additional Litter bin - £800
- Erection of fencing around substation and rear of houses of Rosetta Park - £8000 - £10,000
- CCTV –based on similar CCTV being erected at Girdwood, costs would be approximately £25k.
- Resurfacing of the small unadopted land situated outside the gate between 36 Rosetta Park and 36 Knockbreda Road - £4000
- Installation of security lights within the proximately of the gate - £51,800

3.9 During the course of the resident interviews, a number of items of note were discussed:

- The funeral parlour at the junction of Knockbreda Road and Knock Eden Park was, according to the residents, refused permission by Belfast City Council to hold funeral services within the premises. This was due to concerns around congestion and parked cars, which according to the residents would constitute the same issues as opening the Knockbreda Road entrance into Cherryvale Park and residents have questioned should the P&C committee not have a consistent approach to the Planning committee.
- If parking restrictions are implemented within the area, this will de value properties within and change the areas character.
- The residents interviewed have requested a consultation meeting with either the elected members of Lisnasharragh DEA or members of the P&C committee.

3.10 Officers have met on numerous occasions with Department for Infrastructure officials to discuss any implications on traffic, parking and crossings in regard to the gate. The road service has stated that no additional lighting is required. Parking restrictions lines would not be added prior to the gate opening; however, this

would be monitored and if lines are required there would be no cost to the council.

The Department for Infrastructure had identified three potential options for a traffic light system on Knockbreda Road and in a discussion between council officers and DFI officers in mid-November, DFI notified the Council officer that final plans relating to the second option (see attached) were being finalised as this was determined as the best solution.

Funding has been assigned to the project by The Department for Infrastructure and now awaiting confirmation from the department on timescales.

Options

1. Gate remains closed: the overall survey results support the re-opening of the gate. However, concerns have been expressed by both those in favour and those against reopening the additional pedestrian access.
2. Gate is re-opened: the majority of initial wider survey returns (89% of those indicating a preference) would support this option.

Anti-social behaviour concerns have been costed and are presented in paragraph 3.6.

4.0 Financial & Resource Implications

4.1 Operational arrangements can be accommodated within existing budgets. Additional opening hours would incur additional costs.

5.0 Equality or Good Relations Implications / Rural Needs Assessment

There is no identified equality impact, this will be continually reviewed.”

The Interim Director of Neighbourhood Services advised the Working Group that the funding for the proposed measures listed at 3.8 within the report was not within existing budgets. She outlined that the Equality and Rural Needs Assessment were also outstanding in respect of the assessment of the opening of the gate. The Working Group was advised that there was a triangle of land between the gate and the footpath which officers had not yet been able to identify ownership of. The issue had been referred to Legal Services and that she hoped to submit a more comprehensive report to the People and Communities Committee in August which would address those issues.

A number of Members stated that, while they understood some of the residents' anxieties in relation to the opening of the gate, Anti-Social Behaviour was rare within Cherryvale Park. It was further raised that they did not foresee any major issues occurring in relation to parking in the area. The Interim Director advised the Working Group that she had looked at the statistics provided by Safer Neighbourhood Officers for ASB within the Park and that the levels had been extremely low, however, she advised that a more comprehensive ASB profile for the park would be provided to the People and Communities Committee in August.

A number of Members stated that they wished to see the gate opened. Some Members stated, however, that the proposed safeguarding measures such as the installation of higher fencing around the electricity substation and to the rear of the houses in Rosetta Park which abutted the Park should be completed before the gate was opened.

In response to a Member's request, the Working Group agreed that officers would engage with NI Electricity to request that they would consider permitting the Council to connect to the substation within the park in order to reduce the proposed cost of £51,800 for the security lighting. The Interim Director of Neighbourhood Services also advised that alternative options for security lighting were also being explored.

The Director of Physical Programmes advised the Committee that, in terms of the costs associated with the project, the main avenue would be to seek in-year non-recurrent funding.

Moved by the Lord Mayor (Councillor Long),
Seconded by Councillor Smyth and

Resolved – that, the Working Group:

- notes the update which has been provided; and
- after the funding options have been explored further, the Members representing the Lisnasharragh District Electoral Area would seek to have a meeting with any concerned residents.

Sydenham to Holywood Walking, Wheeling and Cycling Routes Consultation

The Working Group was presented with the following report:

“1.0 Purpose of Report or Summary of main Issues

- 1.1 In March 2022, Members of the City Growth and Regeneration Committee received an update report that the Department for Infrastructure (DfI) was running a public consultation on the Sydenham to Holywood Walking, Wheeling and Cycling routes. At the meeting Members voiced general support and felt that whilst this is an opportunity to deliver better cycling infrastructure the routes as set out in the document were not ideal and agreed for further engagement through the Area Working Groups.**

DfI is seeking Council to submit its preferred route option so that it can begin to plan this route as part of the delivery of the Belfast Cycling Network. Council officers from across departments in Physical Programmes, City & Neighbourhood Services and City Regeneration & Development met to consider the route options and make a recommendation for Members.

The purpose of this report is to propose that Council advises DfI that Route 1 is the preferred option for delivery and seek further engagement with DfI on the development of this through engagement with the East Area Working Group (AWG) and officers.

2.0 Recommendations

2.1 Members are asked to:

- Note the Officers' feedback based on deliverability, alignment with Council priorities, potential to increase connectivity to communities and amenities and agree recommendation of Route 1 as the preferred route option (Red, see Appendix 1 on mod.gov)
- Note the ongoing engagement with DfI and Council officers on the development of this and other routes and resume discussions through the respective Area Working Groups.

3.0 Main report

3.1 On 3 June 2021, the Minister for Infrastructure published '*Planning for the Future of Transport – Time for Change*'. This document articulates the Minister's vision that active travel becomes a pillar of change within towns and cities to cut emissions, to improve health and wellbeing, and to better connect families and communities. It commits to the adoption of the sustainable transport hierarchy where prioritisation is given to sustainable travel by providing for walking and wheeling, then cycling, then public transport ahead of private vehicle use.

3.2 The Minister followed this by publishing '*Making Belfast an Active City – Belfast Cycling Network 2021*' on 4 June 2021. This document set out her ambition to make Belfast a more cycle-friendly city and provides a blueprint for the development and operation of the cycling infrastructure in the city for the next ten years. The Belfast Cycling Network proposes two routes between Belfast and North Down:

- a greenway type route alongside the Belfast to Bangor railway line; and
- a walking and cycling path alongside Holywood Road and the A2 north of Tillysburn.

3.3 The *Belfast Cycling Network Delivery Plan 2022-2031* was published 23 March 2022 and sets out schemes that will be delivered in the short (2022-2025), medium (2025-2028) and long term (2028-2031). The Sydenham to Holywood link is included as a short-term scheme and in February 2022 DfI opened a consultation on these routes and sought views as to whether priority should be given to developing one of three options (see Appendix 1 on mod.gov). Each of the proposed routes is between 4.0 and 4.8km long and all of them start at the underpass vehicular entrance to Victoria Park and terminate near Kinnegar, Holywood. The routes would also provide a link between the existing Comber and Connswater Greenways and Holywood Exchange and the North Down Coastal Path. The preferred route will determine which scheme will be included in the Belfast Cycling Network delivery plan for construction in the short term. The first two routes are

already within the Belfast Cycling Network, but the third route is not a part of the Network:

- Route 1: a path along the railway from Sydenham through Hollywood Exchange (red)
- Route 2: a path along Hollywood Road through Hollywood Exchange (green)
- Route 3: upgrade the cycling route alongside the Sydenham ByPass (blue)

3.4 Route 1 (red) path along the railway from Sydenham through Hollywood Exchange

This is approximately 4 kilometres long and commences at Victoria Park and continues along Larkfield Drive and Inveraray Drive, becoming 'traffic free' at Inveraray Ave. It would involve a new path around Alderman Thomas Patton Playing Field, Shorts Recreational Club and Blanchflower Stadium, near the railway line. A major element is a proposed bridge over the railway which would require significant embankments/ramps to facilitate a bridge in this location. The estimated cost for this scheme is £3,500,000 and the anticipated timeframe for delivery is approximately 48 months.

3.5 Over the past couple of years, and in advance of the recent public consultation, there has been ongoing engagement with the DfI, the East Area Working Group and Officers on cycle routes and greenways. Drawing on the feedback from Members at the East Area Working Group in February, Council Officers in Physical Programmes, City & Neighbourhood Services and City Regeneration & Development met to consider the options and make a recommendation for Members and propose that Council advises DfI that Route 1 is the preferred option for delivery. This is based on several key factors, including that it is the most traffic free route at 25% (Route 2 is 15%, Route 3 is 0%), though all routes will be segregated from the carriageway:

- Route 1 appears to be the safest and most direct route and would support those commuting between Belfast and North Down
- It is fully segregated from traffic and approximately 25% would be traffic-free
- It links other green infrastructure and the Connswater Community Greenway
- Located in close proximity to local community centre and could improve accessibility for users
- Potential to augment emerging projects and enhance use of Thomas Patton Park through enhanced active travel provision
- Opportunity to manage the impact on biodiversity and potential user conflict
- Whilst the route currently shows limited connectivity to communities, officers feel this could be improved and connect to the park and other open spaces and amenities

3.6 Route 2 (green): a path along Holywood Road through Holywood Exchange

This route is approximately 4.8km and is the longest route option. It commences at Victoria Park and continues along Larkfield Drive and Inveraray Drive and Alderman Thomas Patton Memorial Park. It then follows the line of the Holywood Road, but it is not yet determined which side of the road. It uses the Tillysburn grade separated cycle path and would follow the A2 dual carriageway on the east side by upgrading the existing path and providing a physical separation from traffic. Crossings would be required at the roundabout near the bridge and at Airport Road West before the route would continue near the airport fence line and continue east to Kinnegar. The estimated cost for this scheme is £950,000 and the anticipated timeframe for delivery is approximately 24 months.

3.7 Upon consideration Officers have discounted this route due to:

- Less proportion of traffic-free and likely to be less appealing for commuters since it is indirect, follows the dual carriageway and approximately 15% of the route is traffic free
- Potentially more expensive for Council as it is likely to require enhancement or widening of pathways and possibly additional lighting
- Officers noted that it provides good connections to Connswater Community Greenway but there are several pinch points and areas of potential user conflict

3.8 Route 3 (blue): upgrade the cycling route alongside the Sydenham ByPass

This route is approximately 4.4km long and commences in the area of Victoria Park where it would be accessed by the existing ramp to the underpass entrance to the park. It could also be extended 1.4km further towards the city centre using the existing hard shoulder as far as Titanic Quarter station active travel underpass. It would continue along the Sydenham Bypass on the existing city-bound hard should using kerbed segregation as far as the Tillysburn grade separated walking and cycling underpass and follow the path for Route 2 along the A2 dual carriageway on an updated path which would provide physical separation from the motor traffic. It would utilise the existing flyover at Holywood Exchange. Crossings would be required at the roundabout near the bridge and at Airport Road West before the route would continue in close proximity to the airport fence line and continue east to Kinnegar. The estimated cost for this scheme is £750,000 and the anticipated timeframe for delivery is approximately 24 months. This route is not currently included in the Belfast Cycling Network.

3.9 Upon consideration Officers have discounted this route because:

- The East Area Working Group expressed concern about the safety of the Sydenham Road section for cyclists
- Lack of opportunity to connect to communities and amenities
- The significant amount of pollution and poor air quality
- Depending on which side of the street the route follows there could be connections to Victoria Park Connswater Community Greenway but there are several pinch points and areas of potential user conflict
- Likely to be less appealing for commuters since it follows the dual carriageway and is oppressively noisy and none of the route is traffic free, though segregated from motor traffic

3.10 Delivery, funding and maintenance

In terms of delivery of any of the three options, Dfl has advised that the exact location of each route is not yet defined and suggested that the best way to deliver it would be by Dfl and BCC working together as either a joint project or with each organisation leading on the sections on their own land. For example, if it sat within the curtilage of Thomas Patton Park then it would be up to Council to determine where it is best placed, the palette of materials and consider environmental and ecological impacts. It is recommended that there is an ecological assessment at the concept design stage before fully committing to the delivery of the route within the Park. The design and delivery of the route will need to take into account issues within the Park, including the construction of a 4m wide 'shared path' which may result in the loss of existing mature trees/vegetation along the boundary and the need for sections of the path network to be enhanced to make 'shared path' connections between this route and the Hollywood Road entrance.

- 3.11 As part of the design and delivery, consideration will need to be given to the long-term management and maintenance since the sections located on Council land would be the responsibility of Council to maintain. This will have an impact on revenue and future budgets. Additionally, if the route traverses through Alderman Thomas Patton Memorial Park regard will need to be given to public perceptions of safety which may necessitate amendments to the byelaws, provision of lighting and consideration of the park's opening and closing hours or alternative surrounding routes if the park is closed. Additionally, Council and Dfl would need to agree exactly which party leads on the legal agreements in relation to third party land and this could entail additional time and resources to complete. Council would also need to mitigate the potential impact on assets such as pitches, playgrounds, car parks and perhaps even buildings within Council land and lands belonging to third parties. Members should note that Dfl envisages that Route 1 could be delivered in approximately 48 months however, other factors such as an ecological assessment, legal process for agreements/order and planning may alter this initial projection.

3.12 Dfl has noted that there is currently no budget to deliver the scheme at this time but would like to continue to engage with Council to work up options for delivery and once the preferred route has been agreed. Dfl has advised that similar to other projects, they would be open to funding Council for elements of the route through the either Green and Blue Infrastructure Fund (or something equivalent). However, this funding would not cover future management or maintenance.

3.13 Further Member engagement

Dfl presented the proposed Sydenham to Holywood consultation routes at the East AWG meeting on 3 February 2022 where it was agreed that after the completion of the public consultation, Dfl would return to the AWG to present the consultation findings. Given the previous feedback and engagement with Dfl, it is likely that the AWG will continue to be an appropriate mechanism for Dfl, Members and officers across Physical Programmes, City & Neighbourhood Services and City Regeneration & Development to enable further discussions to progress to the next stage.

4.0 Financial & Resource Implications

None associated with this report.

5.0 Equality or Good Relations Implications / Rural Needs Assessment

None associated with this report.”

A number of Members stated that they were supportive of the proposed Route 1.

The Working Group agreed to recommend Route 1 as the preferred option.

Requests to Present at a Future Meeting

Northern Ireland Civil Service Sports Association (NICSSA)

The Working Group noted correspondence which had been received from the Northern Ireland Civil Service Sports Association, who were requesting to present details of an upcoming capital redevelopment programme at the Stormont Estate to the Working Group.

The Working Group acceded to the request and agreed to invite NICSSA to present at a future meeting.

Ulster Rugby

(Councillor Newton, having declared an interest in this item, left the meeting at this point in proceedings)

The Working Group noted correspondence which had been received from Ulster Rugby, who were requesting to present details of the projects which they had been working on recently to develop the organisation and offering, both within the professional, club and school game.

The Director of Physical Programmes advised the Working Group that Ulster Rugby had submitted an application for funding from the Neighbourhood Renewal Fund, an £8million programme to support capital projects across the city, for which the consideration process was ongoing. She outlined that it would not, therefore, be appropriate for the Working Group to receive a presentation from them in respect of their proposal under that fund. However, she explained that other issues and projects related to Ulster Rugby could certainly be discussed.

The Working Group therefore acceded to the request and agreed to invite Ulster Rugby to present at a future meeting but that it would be made clear that they could not discuss their application for Neighbourhood Renewal Funding at any such meeting.

Chairperson