

**LISBURN & CASTLEREAGH CITY COUNCIL**

**Minutes of Planning Committee Meeting held in the Council Chamber and in Remote Locations on Monday, 7 April, 2025 at 10.00 am**

**PRESENT IN CHAMBER:**

Alderman M Gregg (Chair)

Councillor S Burns (Vice-Chair)

Aldermen O Gawith and J Tinsley

Councillors D Bassett, P Catney, D J Craig, U Mackin, A Martin and N Trimble

**IN ATTENDANCE:**

Director of Regeneration and Growth  
Head of Planning & Capital Development  
Principal Planning Officer (PS)  
Senior Planning Officers (MB, PMcF and GM)  
Member Services Officers (CR and CH)

Mr B Martyn (Cleaver Fulton Rankin)

**Commencement of Meeting**

At the commencement of the meeting, the Chair, Alderman M Gregg, welcomed those present to the Planning Committee. He pointed out that, unless the item on the agenda was considered under confidential business, this meeting would be audio recorded. He went on to outline the evacuation procedures in the case of an emergency.

1. **Apologies**

It was agreed to accept an apology for non-attendance at the meeting on behalf of Councillor G Thompson.

2. **Declarations of Interest**

Alderman J Tinsley declared an interest in respect of planning application LA05/2022/1167/F, as he knew the applicant and had facilitated a meeting with Planning Officers. He had not participated in any discussion or debate and remained neutral.

3. **Minutes of Meeting of Planning Committee held on 3 March, 2025**

It was proposed by Councillor U Mackin, seconded by Councillor S Burns and agreed that the minutes of the meeting of Committee held on 3 March, 2025 be confirmed and signed.

LA05/2024/0734/F – Proposal to vary condition 12 of planning approval LA05/2022/0830/F, from no more than 47 dwellings shall be built and occupied until the commercial/industrial units indicated as W1-W6 on the proposed site plan bearing council date stamp 16 March 2022 are fully constructed

In response to comments by Councillor P Catney regarding significant changes being made to an application after public consultation had been carried out, the Head of Planning & Capital Development advised that, in respect of all major developments, Section 54 required the applicant to submit a pre-application notice and carry out further consultation. The public would have had the opportunity, before the above planning application process commenced, to know what the changes to the proposal were and what the purpose of those was. He acknowledged and accepted that, during the planning application process, information had been submitted to the Council that highlighted and explained in great detail why the changes in circumstances were required. This had been shared with Members and was part of the decision-making process. It may not have been something in front of the public but the public would have been aware of the reasons for the application and would have had the opportunity to participate in the public consultation process before the application was made. The Head of Planning & Capital Development gave an assurance that, should similar Section 54 applications come forward in the future to vary a condition, those would still require the applicant to go through the planning application process and provide the public with an opportunity to participate in the public consultation process.

#### 4. Report from the Head of Planning & Capital Development

##### 4.1 Schedule of Applications

The Chair, Alderman M Gregg, advised that there were 2 major and 4 local applications on the schedule for consideration at the meeting.

##### 4.1.1 Applications to be Determined

The Legal Advisor, Mr B Martyn, highlighted paragraphs 43-46 of the Protocol for the Operation of the Lisburn & Castlereagh City Council Planning Committee which, he advised, needed to be borne in mind when determinations were being made.

- (i) LA05/2022/1167/F – Proposed warehouse including chilled store, cold store (Use Class B4) all fixed plant/machinery and ancillary offices/welfare facilities. Proposed food manufacturing facility (Use Class B2). Replacement HGV workshop including vehicle storage unit. Replacement commercial units with ancillary trade counters. Proposed HGV washing bay/fuel bay and bunded underground fuel storage tank, landscaping and all associated HGV parking/car parking/floodlights, site works with servicing via the existing access onto the Moira Road and Halftown Road

The Senior Planning Officer (MB) presented the above application as outlined within the circulated report.

- (i) LA05/2022/1167/F – Proposed warehouse including chilled store, cold store (Use Class B4) all fixed plant/machinery and ancillary offices/welfare facilities. Proposed food manufacturing facility (Use Class B2). Replacement HGV workshop including vehicle storage unit. Replacement commercial units with ancillary trade counters. Proposed HGV washing bay/fuel bay and bunded underground fuel storage tank, landscaping and all associated HGV parking/car parking/floodlights, site works with servicing via the existing access onto the Moira Road and Halftown Road (Contd)

The Committee received Mr A Stephens, accompanied by Mr S Warke and Mr K Somerville, to speak in support of the application and a number of Members' queries were addressed.

A number of Members' queries were responded to by Planning Officers.

### Debate

During debate:

- Councillor P Catney welcomed investment from a local firm to redevelop this site. From an environmental and economic perspective, this showed great faith in the Lisburn area. Councillor Catney was in support of the recommendation of the Planning Officer to approve planning permission;
- Alderman J Tinsley referred to the history of this site and the stigma attached to it and stated what better way to turn that around than by investment on the site by a local firm that was growing throughout Great Britain, Europe and Ireland, securing jobs and bringing new jobs to the area. Alderman Tinsley commended the applicant, his team and Planning Officers for the work that had gone into this application and stated that he was in support of the recommendation of the Planning Officer to approve planning permission;
- Councillor U Mackin congratulated the applicant. It was good to see the progress made by a substantial business operating in the Council area. Councillor Mackin welcomed the application;
- Councillor N Trimble stated that the proposal was a much better use of this site than what had been there previously. He was in support of the recommendation of the Planning Officer to approve planning permission;
- Alderman O Gawith stated that this application had been excellently thought through and the conditions that would apply to any permission granted were right and proper. He was in support of the recommendation of the Planning Officer to approve planning permission;
- Councillor D J Craig stated that this was a much-welcomed development of this site. He welcomed the fact that there would be improvements to the road junction. Councillor Craig was glad to see a local firm doing well and planning to do even better in the future and was in support of the recommendation of the Planning Officer to approve planning permission; and

- (i) LA05/2022/1167/F – Proposed warehouse including chilled store, cold store (Use Class B4) all fixed plant/machinery and ancillary offices/welfare facilities. Proposed food manufacturing facility (Use Class B2). Replacement HGV workshop including vehicle storage unit. Replacement commercial units with ancillary trade counters. Proposed HGV washing bay/fuel bay and bunded underground fuel storage tank, landscaping and all associated HGV parking/car parking/floodlights, site works with servicing via the existing access onto the Moira Road and Halftown Road (Contd)
- the Chair, Alderman M Gregg concurred with comments made by other Members. This application was to be welcomed in the local area and, whilst he had had some concerns regarding flooding, the mitigations in place had allayed those fears. The Chair was in support of the recommendation of the Planning Officer to approve planning permission.

### Vote

Having considered the information provided within the report of the Planning Officer, the Committee agreed unanimously to adopt the recommendation to approve this application.

- (ii) LA05/2021/0360/F – Proposed infill dwelling and garage on lands between 11 and 13 Crossan Road, Lisburn

Alderman J Tinsley left the meeting at the beginning of this item of business (10.52 am) and returned at 12.01 pm.

The Senior Planning Officer (PMcF) presented the above application as outlined within the circulated report.

The Committee received Mr A Stephens to speak in support of the application and a number of Members' queries were addressed.

A number of Members' queries were responded to by Planning Officers.

### Debate

During debate:

- Councillor D J Craig stated that a lot of applications had fallen into the category of being applied for under one set of rules, but being judged on another. Unfortunately for the applicant, this application did not meet with new policy. Councillor Craig deemed that enough credence had been given to the planning history of the site. Having visited the site, it was clear that the gap was not large enough to accommodate 2 properties, as required under the new policy. Councillor Craig was in support of the recommendation of the Planning Officer to refuse planning permission;

(ii) LA05/2021/0360/F – Proposed infill dwelling and garage on lands between 11 and 13 Crossan Road, Lisburn (Contd)

- Councillor N Trimble stated that, in his view, the recommendation was profoundly unfair to the applicant, given the circumstances and the timeline. There had been delays in the process and permission should have been granted before the new policy came into effect. Regrettably, however, the application did not comply with the new policy. Councillor Trimble was unsure that there was significant enough weight to allow the Committee to set aside policy. The application did not comply with COU8, which was unfair to the applicant. Should the decision be made not to grant planning permission, Councillor Trimble encouraged the applicant to refer the application to the Planning Appeals Commission;
- Councillor P Catney agreed that this situation was very difficult and he was not in support of the recommendation of the Planning Officer to refuse planning permission, given that Members were morally obliged to take account of the administrative unfairness;
- Councillor U Mackin stated that this was a finely balanced application. From a pure policy point of view, he could not disagree with the Planning Officer. However, where he did have a problem was with the planning history. In his view, there was a case of administrative unfairness which was no-one's fault, other than the process itself. The process had let the applicant down and caused problems. In May 2023 there had been email correspondence advising that the Officer recommendation would be to approve the application and that this was going to group but through circumstances that had not happened. Councillor Mackin stated that, whilst the application did not directly meet with COU8, on this occasion COU8 had to be tempered by the material consideration of internal processes. On the basis that there had been an intention to recommend approval, Councillor Mackin was not in support of the recommendation of the Planning Officer to refuse planning permission;
- Alderman O Gawith stated that the horrendous delay had caused the problem and that seemed unfair to the applicant. There had been gaps in action on both sides. In terms of COU8, he had learned that how gap sizes were measured was not laid out in policy and that may need to be looked at, at some point. As things were, this application fell on COU8 and Alderman Gawith was reluctantly in support of the recommendation of the Planning Officer to refuse planning permission. However, similar to Councillor Trimble, he too encouraged the applicant to refer the application to the Planning Appeals Commission. As he had been unable to attend the site visit, Alderman Gawith advised that he had taken the time to visit the site before reaching any decision. The Chair, Alderman M Gregg, pointed out that Members were discouraged from making solo site visits as they were not a controlled event; and
- the Chair, Alderman M Gregg, stated that this application came down to timing. There had been a number of similar applications before the Committee in the past that would have been approved under CTY8, but not COU8; the Committee had decided that the decision was issued on COU8 and the Planning Appeals Commission had agreed with the Committee. As difficult as it was, in terms of the timing and nature of this application, Alderman Gregg was in support of the recommendation of the Planning Officer to refuse planning permission.

- (ii) LA05/2021/0360/F – Proposed infill dwelling and garage on lands between 11 and 13 Crossan Road, Lisburn (Contd)

Vote

On a vote being taken, it was agreed to adopt the recommendation of the Planning Officer to refuse planning permission, the voting being:

In favour: Councillor D Bassett, Councillor S Burns, Councillor D J Craig, Alderman O Gawith, Councillor A Martin, Councillor N Trimble and Chair, Alderman M Gregg (7)

Against: Councillor P Catney and Councillor U Mackin (2)

Abstain: (0)

It was noted that, as he not been present for the entirety of consideration of this application, Alderman J Tinsley did not participate in the vote.

Adjournment of Meeting

The Chair, Alderman M Gregg, declared the meeting adjourned at this point for a comfort break (12.25 pm).

Councillor N Trimble left the meeting during the comfort break.

Resumption of Meeting

The meeting was resumed at 12.31 pm.

- (iii) LA05/2024/0775/F – Subdivision of Unit 5 and elevational changes at Unit 5 Drumkeen Retail Park, Upper Galwally, Belfast

The Senior Planning Officer (GM) presented the above application as outlined within the circulated report.

Mr E Loughrey was in attendance to answer any Members' questions but no questions were asked.

There were no queries put to Planning Officers.

Debate

There were no comments made at the debate stage.

- (iii) LA05/2024/0775/F – Subdivision of Unit 5 and elevational changes at Unit 5 Drumkeen Retail Park, Upper Galwally, Belfast (Contd)

Vote

Having considered the information provided within the report of the Planning Officer, the Committee agreed unanimously to adopt the recommendation to approve this application.

Adjournment of Meeting

The Chair, Alderman M Gregg, declared the meeting adjourned at this point for lunch (12.42 pm).

Resumption of Meeting

The meeting was resumed at 1.33 pm.

- (iv) LA05/2020/0991/O – Site for a replacement dwelling, garage and associated siteworks 120m west of St Patricks RC Church, 23a Barnfield Road, Lisburn

The Senior Planning Officer (PMcF) presented the above application as outlined within the circulated report.

The Committee received Mr N Coffey to speak in support of the application and a number of Members' queries were addressed.

A number of Members' queries were responded to by Planning Officers.

Debate

During debate:

- Councillor D J Craig stated that attending the site visit had been very useful. He had seen that the two gable ends were there and seen the division of the rooms. The rear wall was more or less down to the level of where the headers of the windows and door would have been – in his mind that was probably substantial. The difficulty was with the front wall elevation. Parts of it were well below where the headers for the door and windows would have been. If not for that, he would probably have gone against the Officer's recommendation. However, as things were, he was in support of the recommendation of the Planning Officer to refuse planning permission;
- Alderman O Gawith stated that, in his view, the front elevation was so far down, there was not enough to count as a replacement. He was in support of the recommendation of the Planning Officer to refuse planning permission;

(iv) LA05/2020/0991/O – Site for a replacement dwelling, garage and associated siteworks 120m west of St Patricks RC Church, 23a Barnfield Road, Lisburn (Contd)

- the Chair, Alderman M Gregg, stated that the site visit had been very useful to put into context the 80% as a substantial figure that had been given by the Planning Appeals Commission, as had clarification that 80% of all walls were required to be intact. He agreed with Councillor Craig that the gables and rear wall were acceptable, but the front wall did fall short. The figure of 84% provided by the applicant was more than generous, given what had been witnessed on site. Alderman Gregg considered that the front wall fell well below 80% and was in support of the recommendation of the Planning Officer to refuse planning permission; and
- Councillor P Catney stated that he would have liked to support this application simply because of the out-of-the-way site, beyond the Church that was over 250 years old. It would have been good to have someone living on down the lane because of the ongoing antisocial behaviour. However, it had been demonstrated by Officers that what remained was less than 80%. Councillor Catney was in support of the recommendation of the Planning Officer to refuse planning permission.

Vote

On a vote being taken, it was agreed to adopt the recommendation of the Planning Officer to refuse planning permission, the voting being:

In favour: Councillor D Bassett, Councillor S Burns, Councillor P Catney, Councillor D J Craig, Alderman O Gawith, Councillor A Martin, Alderman J Tinsley and Chair, Alderman M Gregg (8)

Against: (0)

Abstain: Councillor U Mackin (1)

(v) LA05/2024/0513/F – Proposed residential development comprising 9 dwellings (1 detached and 8 semi-detached) including all other associated site works (change of house type to plots 39-45 of Planning Approval reference LA05/2023/0292/F) and lands to the south of Mealough Road, west of Saintfield Road, approximately 64 metres northeast of 9 Mealough Rise and 65 metres northeast of 32 Mealough Drive, Carryduff

The Senior Planning Officer (GM) presented the above application as outlined within the circulated report.

The Committee received Mr T Stokes, accompanied by Mr J Fraser and Mr J Anderson, to speak in support of the application and a number of Members' queries were addressed.



- (v) LA05/2024/0513/F – Proposed residential development comprising 9 dwellings (1 detached and 8 semi-detached) including all other associated site works (change of house type to plots 39-45 of Planning Approval reference LA05/2023/0292/F) and lands to the south of Mealough Road, west of Saintfield Road, approximately 64 metres northeast of 9 Mealough Rise and 65 metres northeast of 32 Mealough Drive, Carryduff

A number of Members' queries were responded to by Planning Officers. During questions to Planning Officers, Councillor S Burns requested legal advice in respect of how to deal with the two Section 76 Agreements that would relate to this application, should planning permission be granted.

#### "In Committee"

It was proposed by Councillor S Burns, seconded by Councillor D Bassett and agreed to go 'into committee' to consider this matter. Those members of the public and press in attendance left the meeting (3.00 pm).

Legal advice was provided by the Legal Advisor in respect of the two Section 76 Agreements.

#### Resumption of Normal Business

It was proposed by Councillor D J Craig, seconded by Councillor P Catney and agreed to come out of committee and normal business was resumed (3.06 pm).

#### Debate

During debate:

- Councillor D J Craig stated that he would generally be sceptical about the offsetting of responsibilities from one particular site as it would normally be done for financial reasons rather than social reasons. However, he could clearly see the merits of it in this case with regard to delivering more low cost housing. The overall delivery for the entire Carryduff area was incredibly attractive. The argument that, if there were to be tenants with less mobility and less ability to drive, which would be necessary for anyone living in this area, should be taken into account. Councillor Craig was in support of the recommendation of the Planning Officer to approve planning permission;
- Alderman J Tinsley referred to the gain of 6 additional affordable housing units, which was a benefit. There was also the argument that the proposed location was closer to the main facilities that the public would use, such as shops and bus routes. Alderman Tinsley was content with the movement of affordable housing from one site to the other and was in support of the recommendation of the Planning Officer to approve planning permission;

- (v) LA05/2024/0513/F – Proposed residential development comprising 9 dwellings (1 detached and 8 semi-detached) including all other associated site works (change of house type to plots 39-45 of Planning Approval reference LA05/2023/0292/F) and lands to the south of Mealough Road, west of Saintfield Road, approximately 64 metres northeast of 9 Mealough Rise and 65 metres northeast of 32 Mealough Drive, Carryduff (Contd)
- Councillor U Mackin stated that he too had been sceptical about the changes with this application. However, he was content that affordable housing was not being totally abandoned on the Mealough site as there would still be 9 units. Overall, the gain in affordable housing was to be welcomed to meet the needs of that market in the Carryduff area. Councillor Mackin was in support of the recommendation of the Planning Officer to approve planning permission;
  - Councillor P Catney stated that he was in support of the recommendation of the Planning Officer to approve planning permission. It was good to see working between housing providers to get more social housing in an area where it was much needed. In response to his comments regarding looking, in the future, at streamlining Section 76 options to ensure more social housing, the Chair, Alderman M Gregg, that that would be a matter for consideration in the development of the next Local Development Plan;
  - Alderman O Gawith stated that he was in support of the recommendation of the Planning Officer to approve planning permission. This application would provide more social and affordable housing; however, he remained cynical about why the developer would be willing to do this and it was a shame that all the units originally planned for Mealough could not have continued as well as those in this application; and
  - the Chair, Alderman M Gregg, stated that he liked to see the total number of units being considered when looking at affordable housing elements. That was somewhere where the Committee and Officers failed earlier on when the new Local Development Plan was coming forward. He was glad to see that the total units here exceeded the minimum 20% requirement. He also welcomed that this was a gain as far as social housing was concerned in Carryduff and was something that was not part of the affordable housing element in Mealough. It did address the broader need of housing requirements within the greater Carryduff area. Alderman Gregg was in support of the recommendation of the Planning Officer to approve planning permission. He hoped that promises came to fruition and that Officers monitored the Mealough site and kept a close eye on the density of this site.

### Vote

Having considered the information provided within the report of the Planning Officer, the Committee agreed unanimously to adopt the recommendation to approve this application, on the basis that it would be subject to a Section 76 Agreement and the modification of the existing Section 76 Agreement.

Adjournment of Meeting

The Chair, Alderman M Gregg, declared the meeting adjourned at this point for a comfort break (3.25 pm).

Councillor D Bassett left the meeting during the comfort break.

Resumption of Meeting

The meeting was resumed at 12.31 pm.

- (vi) LA05/2023/0623/F – Proposed housing development consisting of 13 dwellings (5no. detached and 8no. semi-detached) with garages and associated site works plus pumping station. Existing dwelling No.39a Gravelhill Road to be demolished (amended plans) at 39a Gravelhill Road, Lisburn

The Senior Planning Officer (MB) presented the above application as outlined within the circulated report.

There was no-one registered to speak in respect of this application.

A number of Members' queries were responded to by Planning Officers.

Debate

There were no comments made at the debate stage.

Vote

Having considered the information provided within the report of the Planning Officer, the Committee agreed unanimously to adopt the recommendation to approve this application.

4.2 Statutory Performance Indicators – February 2025

Members were provided with information in relation to statutory performance indicators for February 2025. It was proposed by Councillor P Catney, seconded by Alderman O Gawith and agreed that this information be noted.

4.3 Appeal Decision – LA05/2018/0862/F

It was proposed by Alderman O Gawith, seconded by Councillor D J Craig and agreed that the report and decision of the Planning Appeals Commission in respect of the above appeal be noted.

4.4 Appeal Decision – LA05/2019/1077/F

It was proposed by Alderman O Gawith, seconded by Councillor D J Craig and agreed that the report and decision of the Planning Appeals Commission in respect of the above appeal be noted.

4.5 Appeal Decision – LA05/2022/0980/O

It was proposed by Alderman O Gawith, seconded by Councillor D J Craig and agreed that the report and decision of the Planning Appeals Commission in respect of the above appeal be noted.

4.6 Appeal Decision – LA05/2022/1103/F

It was proposed by Alderman O Gawith, seconded by Councillor D J Craig and agreed that the report and decision of the Planning Appeals Commission in respect of the above appeal be noted.

4.7 Appeal Decision – LA05/2023/0087/O

It was proposed by Alderman O Gawith, seconded by Councillor D J Craig and agreed that the report and decision of the Planning Appeals Commission in respect of the above appeal be noted.

4.8 Pre-application Notice (PAN) for a proposed mixed use development comprising retail units, 67 residential units, with access arrangements, car parking, amenity space, landscaping and all other associated site works at 24 Antrim Street, Lisburn

It was proposed by Councillor P Catney, seconded by Alderman J Tinsley and agreed to note the information on the content of the Pre-application Notice and that it be submitted in accordance with the relevant section of the legislation and related guidance.

4.9 Notification by Telecommunication Operator(s) of Intention to Utilise Permitted Development Rights

It was proposed by Councillor P Catney, seconded by Councillor A Martin and agreed to note from the report, information regarding notification by telecommunication operators of intention to utilise Permitted Development Rights at a number of locations in the Council area.

In response to comments by Alderman J Tinsley regarding a telecommunication pole having been erected on a constituent's property which was blocking sightlines, the Head of Planning & Capital Development asked that he pass details to the Enforcement Team in order that a conversation could be had with the appropriate operator, if necessary.

4.10 Letter to Chief Executive in respect of Planning Fee Regulations

It was proposed by Alderman O Gawith, seconded by Councillor P Catney and agreed that the planned uplift in planning fees be noted.

4.11 Local Development Plan 2032 Quarterly Update

It was proposed by Councillor A Martin, seconded by Alderman O Gawith and agreed that the update on progress with the Local Development Plan be noted.

4.12 Enforcement Quarterly Update

It was proposed by Alderman J Tinsley, seconded by Councillor P Catney and agreed that the planning enforcement update in respect of the caseload be noted.

Alderman J Tinsley paid tribute to the hard work of the Enforcement Team.

5. Any Other Business

5.1 Date of Next Meeting

The Chair, Alderman M Gregg, advised that the next meeting of the Committee would be held on Monday, 12 May, 2025.

Conclusion of the Meeting

At the conclusion of the meeting, the Chair, Alderman M Gregg, thanked those present for their attendance.

There being no further business, the meeting was terminated at 4.17 pm.

---

Chair/Mayor