

**SITE VISIT REPORT: MONDAY 20 November 2023**

*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*

**LA01/2021/1530/F- Beside 76 Finvoy Road, Ballymoney BT53 7JG**

Proposed by Cllr Wallace, seconded by Cllr Anderson

**App Type: Full Application**

**Proposal: Shepherds hut style glamping pod for holiday let**

**Present:** Ald Boyle, Coyle and Cllrs Archibald, Hunter, Kennedy, Wallace and Watton

Officials S Mathers, G Doherty

**Apologies:** None

**Comments:**

Site visit took place on the site frontage on the “loop” road. S Mathers pointed out the location of the site and that it was within the curtilage/ plot of the dwelling at no. 76 Finvoy Road. He showed the site layout plan (Drawing 02B) and the elevation drawing of the shepherd hut (Drawing 03). Referring to PPS 16 Tourism, S Mathers advised that there was no provision in policy to allow for a such a single holiday unit. Referring to Policy TSM 6, he advised that a single holiday unit does not comprise a “holiday park” as permitted by policy subject to specific criteria.

A Member asked why the “could not be located in a settlement” refusal reason was applicable. S Mathers advised this refusal reason was applied, as a matter of course, where a development proposal did not align with policy permitting it in the countryside.

Members asked if two units would comprise a holiday park for the purposes of the policy. S Mathers advised that while the Policy was not prescriptive regarding numbers, a reasonable interpretation of the term indicated substantive development and that two units were unlikely to be considered a holiday park. Members asked if three units would comprise a holiday park. S Mathers advised that while this was minimal, three units may be considered a holiday park in specific circumstances. He added that the proposal was for a

single unit and that this clearly was not permitted by policy. He stated that approval of such development could set a precedent for single holiday units in residential gardens/ plots in the countryside, that may be difficult to distinguish from other similar proposals on such larger plots.

S Mathers stated that the proposal, by reason of its design and location would fail to integrate. Members asked as to whether the metal shed within the curtilage of No. 76 had planning permission. S Mathers advised that the position would be verified.

S Mathers advised that while there was an access reason for refusal, this could be addressed through submission of amended plans (if the proposal was otherwise acceptable), principally to extend the extent of the north visibility splay.