

# Planning Committee

Tuesday, 20th September, 2016

## MEETING OF PLANNING COMMITTEE

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

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

### **Apologies**

An apology was reported on behalf of Councillor Jones.

### **Minutes**

The minutes of the meetings of 26th July and 16th 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 1st September, subject to the omission of those matters in respect of which the Council had delegated its powers to the Committee.

### **Declaration of Interest**

In respect of item 10. l) LA04/2015/1570/F - Single storey side and rear extension, first floor ensuite extension to side with rear roof extension at 11 Pirrie Park Manor, Councillor Mullan declared an interest in that she had referred this application to be discussed at the Committee.

Regarding item 10. d) LA04/2015/0689/F - Extension to offices at Rosemount House, 21 – 23 Sydenham Road, Councillor Lyons declared an interest, in so far as he had submitted a letter of support to the Planning Department regarding the application.

### **Routine Correspondence - Review of Architectural or Historic Interest**

The Committee noted the correspondence which had been received from the Department for Communities regarding the unchanged statutory listing of the following structures:

- Dr Cooke Memorial Statue College Square;
- Ferguson Memorial, Balmoral Cemetery, Stockman's Lane; and
- Grovelands, Musgrave Park, Stockman's Lane.

**Planning Committee,  
Tuesday, 20th September, 2016**

**NILGA Planning Training Events**

The Committee noted the forthcoming NILGA Planning Training events and agreed that the five places available be offered to Members of the Planning Committee in the first instance, and any remaining places available be offered to other Members and Planning Officers.

**Committee Site Visit – 31st August, 2016**

Pursuant to its decisions at the meeting of 16th August, it was noted that the Committee had undertaken a site visit on 31st August in respect of planning application LA04/2016/0559/F - Construction of 4 office blocks - Block A 10 storeys, Block B 14 storeys, Block C and Block D 3 storeys plus 4 retail units, plant and car parking with external plaza and associated landscaping - Site at the junction of Stewart Street/East Bridge Street and West of Central Station East Bridge Street.

**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 Issued**

The Committee noted a list of decisions which had been taken under delegated authority by the Director of Planning and Place, and all other planning decisions which had been issued by the Planning Department between 9th August and 12th September.

**Departmental Performance Update**

The Director provided an oral overview of the Department's performance to date:

*Planning Applications*

- 227 applications had been validated in August (157 in July);
- More than double the number of applications had been received in the same period in 2015 (102); and
- Overall numbers of applications received this year had increased by 30%. (669 up to 31st August, 2015 compared to 956 up to 31st August, 2016).

*Planning Decisions*

- 191 decisions had been issued in August ,2016 (223 in July);
- 95% approval rate; and
- 171 (89.5%) decisions had been issued under delegated authority.

**Planning Committee,  
Tuesday, 20th September, 2016**

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

- 1,114 live planning applications were in the system at the end of August (1,118 in July);
- 61% of applications had been in the system for less than 6 months; and
- Less than 85 legacy applications were outstanding.

*Performance against statutory Targets (figures available up to 31st July)*

- 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. In July, the average processing time to decide major applications was 60 weeks. This included legacy applications and those Major applications which had been delayed whilst a Section 76 agreement had been put in place; and
- 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. In July, the average processing time to decide local applications was 14.4 weeks.

The Committee noted the contents of the report and that a copy of the report would be issued to the Committee after the meeting.

**Update on Article 4 Directions**

The Director reminded the Committee that, at its meeting in June, 2016, it had approved the serving of Notice of Article 4 Directions in Adelaide Park and Malone Park Conservation Areas restricting some of the householder permitted development rights.

He explained that there had been an error in the report in that information on the associated fee of £64 should have been included. He advised that an objection had also been received regarding the initial consultation in so far as not all householders had received the consultation letter.

The Committee agreed that a further consultation exercise takes place regarding the Article 4 Directions on Adelaide Park and Malone Park Conservation Areas to ensure all householders would be notified and the associated fee communicated.

**Local Development Plan - Draft Vision and Objectives**

The Committee considered the following report, together with the associated documents which had been published on the Council's website:

**“1.0 Relevant Background Information**

**1.1 Purpose**

The Preferred Options Paper (POP) provides the basis for consulting with the public and stakeholders on a series of options for dealing with key issues in the plan area. It aims to stimulate public comment and help interested parties to become involved in a more meaningful way at this earliest stage of plan preparation.

1.2 Public and stakeholder participation as part of the preparation of the preferred options paper is regarded as crucial, particularly in identifying relevant local issues which need to be considered from the outset of plan preparation. Effective community and stakeholder engagement also strengthens the evidence base for plans and strategies which in turn, is used to inform the preparation and help justify the ‘soundness’ of the local development plan.

1.3 Analysis of the emerging evidence will provide the basis to develop a distinctive vision and objectives which need to be addressed by the plan.

**2.0 Recommendations**

2.1 Members are asked to:-

- Approve the Vision and Objectives Summary Document (copy available on the Council’s website).

**3.0 Main Report**

3.1 A series of workshops for members and two rounds of party briefings were carried out as part of the preparation leading up to the Preferred Options Paper.

3.2 Council must prepare a POP to inform interested parties and individuals on the matters that may have a direct effect on the plan area and to set out possible options for development as well as a council’s preferred option. The purpose of the POP is to set out:

- a series of options for dealing with key issues in the plan area;
- evidence to appraise the different issues and options; and
- a council’s preferred options and its justification.

- 3.3** The appended Vision and Objectives summary document has been developed from the consideration of the evidence base and the emerging work in the Community Plan. The Vision and Objectives provide a structure for the consideration of the preferred options that will be brought to Committee in October.
- 3.4** As the preparation of the POP involves formulating options for growth and deciding on a preferred option, it is not necessary at this stage to request or gather detailed information on smaller individual sites. The receipt of more detailed information from consultees as well as research and survey information can be carried out in stages in line with the level of detail required for each plan document being prepared.
- 3.5** Options at the POP stage should concentrate on key plan issues which are capable of implementation and represent a range of different approaches within the realm of the plan.
- 3.6** As the POP will influence the preparation of the Plan Strategy and Local Policies Plan, the options and alternatives contained in the POP, should focus on how the Plan Strategy or Local Policies Plan will implement the strategic vision and objectives whilst taking account of the regional planning framework provided by the Regional Development Strategy (RDS) 2035, prevailing planning policy and any other policy and advice issued by the Department. Council must also consider other information such as the Community Plan and any other local strategies in order to ensure that the subsequent LDP is locally distinctive and as comprehensive as possible to facilitate an integrated and coordinated approach to the planning and development of the area.
- 3.7** The options considered should be realistic and deliverable. Therefore, in some cases there may only be one reasonable option available. Under these circumstances, the alternative would be to consider the scenario without the implementation of the plan i.e. 'do nothing' option. If a council considers that there are no alternative options available, then this should be explained and justified.
- 3.8** The POP will set out a council's vision and overall objectives, a series of options for dealing with key issues in the plan area and Council's preferred options and justification for choosing them. The options considered should be set within the regional and prevailing planning policy as well as other

relevant regional and local plans and strategies including the Belfast Agenda.

- 3.9** The publication of the Preferred Options Paper will trigger the beginning of the formal engagement process and with it a myriad of communication-related actions across a range of media and should also be undertaken in accordance with the requirements set out in a council's agreed SCI and Timetable for the LDP. In line with our Statement of Community Consultation the council must make the POP available for public consultation for a period of 12 weeks.
- 3.10** As the POP aims to stimulate public comment and views that will inform the content of the LDP, it is important that all those who may wish to comment on the POP are made aware that they have an opportunity to do so. Before a council prepares and submits its development plan document to the Department, it must publicise its POP and make it available for public consultation.
- 4.0** **Finance and Resource Implications**
- 4.1** This is a new element of work for the Planning and Place Department and the impact of the additional workload will be kept under review
- 5.0** **Equality or Good Relations Implications**
- 5.1** The ongoing work has been developed in line with the Council's Equality and Good Relations frameworks and policies."

The Committee noted the content of the report and approved the Vision and Objectives Summary Document as set out in Appendix 1 of the report (copy available on the Council's website).

**Restricted Item**

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

**Planning Advertising - Efficiency Agenda**

The Committee was reminded that, at its meeting on 16th August, it had agreed in principle to review the advertising options for planning applications to deliver the efficiency target saving of £150K and deferred consideration of the options outlined in the report until the next meeting, to allow further clarification on the options available, draft criteria of a tendering process, and information on alternative ways of advertising planning applications.

**Planning Committee,  
Tuesday, 20th September, 2016**

The Director of Planning and Place outlined the contents of the report which included information on the tendering exercise, readership figures of various newspapers, Council communication methods and a range of methods to target businesses.

After discussion, the Committee agreed to adopt the recommendations contained within the report, that is to:

1. the use of a tender exercise to appoint a single newspaper as the preferred advertising approach from 1st April, 2017 to fulfil the Council's obligation to notify the community of local planning development proposals and to deliver the targeted £150k efficiency savings;
2. the business specific targeting set out in paragraph 1.11 of the report; and
3. include a signposting advert in every edition of the City Matters.

**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 - LA04/2016/0559/F - Construction of 4 office blocks - Block A (10 storeys), Block B (14 storeys), Block C and Block D (3 storeys plus 4 retail units), plant and car parking with external plaza and associated landscaping - Site situated at the junction of Stewart Street/East Bridge Street and West of Central Station East Bridge Street**

(Councillor Lyons and Reynolds were not in attendance at this point)

The Committee was reminded that, at its meeting on 16th August, it had deferred consideration of an application for LA04/2016/0559/F - Construction of 4 office blocks - Block A (10 storeys), Block B (14 storeys), Block C and Block D (3 storeys plus 4 retail units), plant and car parking with external plaza and associated landscaping at a site situated at the junction of Stewart Street/East Bridge Street and West of Central Station East Bridge Street. That decision had been taken to enable the Committee to undertake a site visit in order to acquaint Members with the site and to assess the issues which had been outlined in the case officer's written report regarding the height, scale, mass and also the potential impact on neighbouring properties.

The case officer presented an addendum report and explained that, in addition to the representations outlined in the report, after the agenda report had been published, additional information had been submitted by objectors. She advised the Committee that issues had been raised regarding the scale, massing and design of the proposal, the differences in the current application in relation to the former proposal (floor height, gradient of surrounding roads) and planning process and policy concerns. She explained further that the objections had suggested unsatisfactory independent design comments, and that the proposal would not contribute to sustainable development. She advised that the correspondence received had also alleged that the development may lead to

**Planning Committee,  
Tuesday, 20th September, 2016**

problems of access to the surrounding area and the Tunnels Project, car parking issues, overshadowing, and anti-social behaviour.

The case officer advised that a meeting had also taken place with Dr. A. McDonnell MP and local residents on 15th September, in which scale and massing, car parking issues and objections not being considered had been raised.

The case officer highlighted that additional information had also been submitted by Urban Prospects Limited, which suggested that the revised building layout presented a more appropriate response to the surroundings; the amended scale, massing and form achieved a better composition; and suggested that conditions should also be attached to the proposed approval for the application.

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 representations from Ms. A. Campbell, Ms. T. Power, and Ms. A. Stitt, on behalf of residents. Ms. Campbell outlined a range of objections to the proposal which related to the size, scale, massing, design layout and parking, together with its potential impact on the surrounding residential houses. In addition, Councillor Hargey explained her objections to the recommendations and suggested that the connectivity to the Tunnels Project would be compromised.

Councillor Craig outlined his support for the application and specifically to the potential for investment and new jobs for the area.

The Committee also received representations from the applicant, Mr. P. Kearney, and Mr A. Mains, representing Kilmona Holdings, and Mr. C. Wilson, representing Jefferies Loan Core. Mr. Kearney clarified a number of issues which had been raised by the objectors and suggested that the proposal would provide positive benefits to the area, Grade A office employment space, jobs and apprenticeships, developer contribution to complete public realm works in the area, the potential of commercial rates, and the opportunity to help redevelop, in conjunction with the community, the Tunnels Project.

The deputation answered a range of Members' questions regarding car parking, traffic, the potential of a transport co-ordinator, the planting of trees, jobs and apprenticeships, prospective tenants, access and the relationship with the impending Tunnels Project, the developer's contribution, and community consultation.

During discussion, the Director advised the Committee that new information such as photographs, third party information, models, and handouts were not permitted at the Committee as they were unable to be verified and were contrary to the operating protocol.



**Planning Committee,  
Tuesday, 20th September, 2016**

**Proposal**

Moved by Councillor McAteer,  
Seconded by Councillor Garrett,

That the Committee, given the issues which had been raised regarding the scale, mass and design, agrees to defer consideration of the application to enable a further opinion and advice to be sought from the Ministerial Advisory Group.

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

**Further Proposal**

Moved by Councillor Armitage,  
Seconded by Councillor Hussey,

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 and, in accordance with Section 76 of the Planning Act (Northern Ireland) 2015, delegates power to the Director of Planning and Place, in conjunction with the Town 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 delegates power to the Director of Planning and Place for the final wording of the conditions.

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

During discussion, the Committee also requested that digital walk-throughs and appropriate visuals of significant applications be considered by the Planning Officers as part of future Planning Application presentations.

**(Meeting adjourned for 10 minutes at this point)**

(Councillors Lyons and Reynolds entered the meeting at this point)

**LA04/2015/1570/F - Single storey side and rear extension, first floor ensuite extension to side with rear roof extension at 11 Pirrie Park Manor**

(Councillor Mullan, 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 Hussey had left the room whilst the item was under consideration)

**Planning Committee,  
Tuesday, 20th September, 2016**

The Committee was apprised of the principal aspects of an application which sought permission for a single storey side and rear extension, first floor ensuite extension to side with rear roof extension.

The Committee received representations from Mr. J. Phelan, resident, who outlined a range of objections to the proposal which related to the removal and replacement of trees, the potential for future development of the site, together with its potential impact on the surrounding residential houses and suggested that the documents on the planning portal had been difficult to understand.

Councillor Hargey informed the Committee of her support of the recommendation to approve the application.

The Committee also received representations from Mr. S. Quigg, applicant, and Mr. J. Casey, planning consultant, who acted on behalf of the applicant. Mr. Casey clarified a number of issues which had been raised by the objector and outlined the background to the proposed residential application. He highlighted that the removal and replacement trees had been granted consent and had been recommended by the Tree Protection Order Officer.

The case officer informed the Committee that the plan outlined in the presentation was an amended block plan received on 15th September.

After discussion, the Committee granted approval to the application, subject to the imposing of the conditions set out in the case officer's report.

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

**LA04/2015/0689/F - Extension to offices at Rosemount House,  
21 – 23 Sydenham Road**

(Councillor Lyons, 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 case officer outlined the principal aspects of an application for the proposed demolition of existing buildings to facilitate extension to existing offices for additional accommodation, re-cladding of existing office building, additional car parking, landscaping and all associated site works.

She explained that the proposal was contrary to Zoning BHA 06 of BMAP as the site was located outside the Sydenham Business Park (the only area within the zoning where B1(a) Use was acceptable) and the threshold of 5000 sq. metres of permissible office space had already been exceeded within this location. However, considering other factors including the nature of the business, the economic benefits to the wider area and the lack of available Grade A Office floor space within the City Centre that was suitable, viable and available, the extension, on balance, was considered appropriate at this location.

**Planning Committee,  
Tuesday, 20th September, 2016**

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

The Committee also noted that as the case officer report referenced letters of support or objection received from elected representatives, it would be helpful if further information was outlined in all future reports regarding the content of such correspondence.

**LA04/2016/0967/F - 8 Storey residential development comprising 88 apartments at 55 - 71 Ormeau Road**

The Committee was informed that the application sought permission for the proposed erection of an eight storey residential development comprising of 88 apartments with car parking, amenity space and associated site works.

The case officer advised that there was a live application on the site, however, the current proposed application had been amended to change the lower floor from retail to residential use. She highlighted that the rear elevation from that previously approved under Z/2010/0245/F, with the central part of the building set back over 6 floors, which would significantly reduce the impact on the properties to the rear.

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 Town 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.

**LA04/2015/0609/F - Purpose built managed student accommodation comprising of 620 units with associated amenity and ancillary support accommodation with 54 lower ground floor parking spaces at Site 3, 140 Donegall Street**

The Committee was informed that the application sought permission for purpose built managed student accommodation comprising of 620 units with associated amenity and ancillary support accommodation with 54 lower ground floor parking spaces.

The case officer outlined the principal aspects of the proposal and explained that, after assessment, it had been recommended for refusal on the grounds, that:

1. The proposal was currently contrary to the Belfast Metropolitan Area Plan 2015 as the site was zoned for social housing;
2. The proposal was contrary to Belfast Metropolitan Area Plan 2015 in that the proposal would, if permitted, result in overdevelopment of the site and an inappropriate form of development due to its scale, massing and design causing unacceptable damage to the character and appearance of the area;

**Planning Committee,  
Tuesday, 20th September, 2016**

3. The proposal was contrary to the Strategic Planning Policy Statement for Northern Ireland, Policy QD1 of Planning Policy Statement 7 'Quality Residential Environments' in that it would, if permitted, cause unacceptable damage to the character and residential amenity of the area due to the uncharacteristic and inappropriate height, scale and mass and lack of amenity areas; and
4. The proposal was contrary to policy BH11 of the Department's Planning Policy Statement 6 in that insufficient information had been provided to demonstrate that the proposal would not, if permitted, adversely affect the setting of a listed buildings at St. Patrick's Roman Catholic Church, Donegall Street, Belfast, St. Patrick's Parochial House, 199 Donegall Street, the former St. Patrick's Christian Brother's School, Donegall Street, and 201-205 Donegall Street, Belfast due to the inappropriate scale, form, massing, height, and proportions.

The case officer clarified that there was an error within the report, regarding the reasons for refusal outlined within the Executive Summary of the report, however, those outlined under section 11.0 were the correct reasons for refusal for consideration by the Committee.

The Committee refused the application for the reasons as set out in section 11.0 of the case officer's report.

**LA04/2015/0840/F - Change of use to 8 apartments at 42 - 48 Upper Newtownards Road**

The Committee considered an application for the change of use from 2 retail units at ground floor with offices/residential above to 7 apartments, new frontage, alterations to the rear extensions and provision of a rear terrace at the first floor level.

The case officer advised that the Development Plan (BMAP) identified the site as within the development limits of Belfast as a shopping/commercial area and within an Area of Townscape Character (ATC), Hollywood Arches (BT 034).

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

**Y/2015/0405/F - Pitched roof and extension at Ladas Drive**

The case officer outlined the principal aspects of an applications for the provision of a pitched roof, single storey store extension to the side and single storey link corridor extension to rear of building.

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

**Planning Committee,  
Tuesday, 20th September, 2016**

**LA04/2015/0052/F - Erection of 13 social/affordable housing units (7 two bed townhouses and 6 two bed apartments) with associated parking, landscaping and road works, with access from Park Avenue via adjacent approval Z/2010/1434/F including provision for revised access/parking to masonic hall. Park Avenue**

The Committee was informed that the application sought permission for the erection of 13 social/affordable housing units (7, two bed townhouses and 6, two bed apartments) with associated parking, landscaping and road works, with access from Park Avenue via adjacent approval Z/2010/1434/F including provision for revised access/parking to a Masonic hall.

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

**LA04/2016/0581/F - Extension of existing office building to provide additional office floor space and single retail unit at Centre House, 69 - 87 Chichester Street**

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

The Committee was informed that the application sought permission for the extension of an existing office building to provide additional office floor space and a single retail unit, including the demolition of the existing 3 storey office building at 9 Gloucester Street.

The case officer advised that part of the site was within the ownership of Belfast City Council and confirmed that the applicant had been informed and a revised Certificate of land ownership had been submitted serving notice on Belfast City Council.

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.

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

**LA04/2015/0141/O - 9 Storey office building including ground floor car parking on site adjacent to 14 Little Patrick St. and opposite 23 - 33 Little York Street**

The Committee considered an application for outline planning permission for a proposed 9 storey office building including ground floor car parking.

The case officer advised that the site was located within the development limits of Belfast in the Belfast Metropolitan Area Plan (BMAP) and was identified as being within Belfast City Centre and was also located in Designation CC015- Laganside and Docks Character Area.

**Planning Committee,  
Tuesday, 20th September, 2016**

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

**LA04/2016/1482/F - Temporary inflatable exhibition structure on site adjacent to 7 Queens Road**

The Committee considered an application for a temporary inflatable exhibition structure with associated surface car parking.

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.

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

**LA04/2015/0668/F - 96 Residential units on lands adjacent and east of 43 Stockmans Way**

The Committee was informed that the application sought permission for the demolition of existing buildings and the erection of a residential development comprising of 96 units and associated car parking and landscaping.

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 Town 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.

The Committee also requested that the possibility for community benefits also be considered as part of the Section 76 agreement such as the inclusion of St. Brigid's GAC in terms of amenity and recreational facility potential.

**LA04/2016/1373/F - Security fence on lands to the former Dargan Road landfill site;**

**LA04/2016/1259/A - 2 Vertical banners at Waterfront Hall Conference and Exhibition Centre; and**

**LA04/2016/1844/A - Three vertical totems - Waterfront Hall Conference and Exhibition Centre, 2 Lanyon Place**

The Committee agreed to deal with the aforementioned items together.

The case officer outlined the principal aspects of the three applications, and it was noted that the applications, in accordance with the Scheme of Delegation, had been presented to the Committee since the Council was the applicant.

**Planning Committee,  
Tuesday, 20th September, 2016**

The Committee granted approval for the applications, subject to the imposing of the conditions set out in the case officer's reports.

**LA04/2016/0086/F - Proposed two storey office building, amended access and installation of a weigh bridge at lands opposite 86 Duncrue Street**

The case officer outlined the principal aspects of an application for a two storey office building, amended access and installation of a weigh bridge.

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

**LA04/2015/1435/F - Community Hall and Landscaping to the rear of 25 - 36 Annadale Flats**

The Committee considered an application for the construction of a new building to facilitate community group activities. It included the enhancement and reconfiguration of existing landscaped areas. The case officer informed the Committee that the site was an area of open public ground located to the rear of properties along Ava Avenue, Delhi Parade and Haywood Drive, off the Ormeau Road which consisted of a communal grassed area with several trees, surrounded by a path.

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

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

**LA04/2016/1293/F - Change of use from a dwelling to a House in Multiple Occupancy at 21 Whitewell Parade**

The Committee was informed that the application sought permission for a change of use from a dwelling to a House in Multiple Occupancy (HMO).

The case officer advised that the site was not within a designated HMO Policy Area, as zoned in BMAP and records compiled by the Northern Ireland Housing Executive and the Council had indicated that there were no existing HMO's in Whitewell Parade.

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

**LA04/2016/0149/F - Lionra Uladh, a new build facility for Raidio Failte to house Irish Language Broadcast, Training, Recording and Archiving and community/visitor facilities at lands situated at Divis Street, at the corner of Divis Street/West Link junction**

**Planning Committee,  
Tuesday, 20th September, 2016**

The Committee was apprised of the principal aspects of an application which sought permission for a radio station to facilitate broadcasting, production, recording and archiving along with an exhibition space.

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

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

**LA04/2016/0343/F - 6 Apartments in 2 two storey blocks - Adjacent to  
91 Gilnahirk Road**

The case officer outlined the principal aspects of an applications for the construction of 6 two bedroom apartments in 2 two storey blocks with associated site works.

The Case Officer advised that there was an error under the recommendation on the summary page in the report which should read '**Approval**' not '*Refusal*'.

After discussion, the Committee, given the issues which had been raised regarding the issue of car parking and traffic associated with the proposal, 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 Committee noted that Transport NI would be requested to urgently respond regarding their position on the application in relation to traffic and the proximity of the proposal to schools, before the next meeting.

The Committee also agreed that Transport NI be invited to attend an information session with the Committee regarding the principles of responding to planning application consultation requests.

Chairperson