

SITE VISIT REPORT: MONDAY 22 January 2024

Committee Members: Alderman, Boyle, Coyle, Scott, Stewart, S McKillop (Vice Chair) and; Councillors Anderson, C Archibald, Hunter, Kennedy, McGurk, McMullan (Chair), Peacock, Nicholl, Storey, Wallace and Watton

LA01/2021/1166/F- 30m NW of 32 Quay Road, Ballycastle

Proposed by Cllr Archibald, Seconded by Cllr Kennedy

App Type: Full Application

Proposal: Proposed three storey dwelling

Present: Ald Stewart and Cllrs Archibald, Kennedy, Storey and Watton
Officials S Mathers, E Hudson

Apologies: Ald Boyle, Cllr Hunter

Comments:

Site visit commenced in no. 32 given the inclement weather. S Mathers outlined that the proposal was unacceptable for several reasons, specifically; out of character; did not fit into the urban grain of the Conservation Area; design inappropriate for Conservation Area and AONB; garden area overlooked by rear of no. 32; amenity of no. 32 compromised by proposal looking into back of it; amenity of no. 34 compromised by second floor gable window and; inadequate parking (four spaces rather than 6). Plans shown to illustrate issues. Members asked about the extent of the Conservation Area. S Mathers advised whole site within Conservation Area and that designation was extensive. Members asked about on-street parking. S Mathers stated this would need to have been demonstrated. Members asked about the development recently constructed adjacent the war memorial and whether this was comparable. S Mathers stated that he would request the presenting officer to consider. Members asked whether there were objections from no. 32. S Mathers advised there was an objection from M Magee at no. 32 and their status was unclear e.g. tenant or other occupant.

Site visit resumed in the rear patio area of no. 32. S Mathers explained that the outhouse was to be demolished to provide the means of access. Showed location of proposed garden to no. 32, car parking area, amenity area for new dwelling and location of new dwelling. Explained amenity issues. Members asked about the height of the building relative to the rear wing of the building at

no. 30. S Mathers resolved to have this verified. Members asked about the lane. S Mathers advised that while this was included in the previous (withdrawn) application, it was not included in this proposal.

Site visit resumed across Quay Road from no. 32. S Mathers pointed out the critical view and how the proposal would be visible from this public aspect within the Conservation Area. Members asked about other comparable approvals. S Mathers advised that there were no immediate examples and that the matter would be advised to the presenting officer.