

**SITE VISIT REPORT: MONDAY 25<sup>th</sup> September 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*

**11.20am**

LA01/2022/1196/O – Atlantic Road, Portrush

**App Type: Outline Application**  
**Proposal: Site for new dwelling and garage infilling gap within built up frontage to laneway.**

**Present:** Ald Boyle, Coyle, Stewart, Councillors Hunter, Storey and Watton  
Officials S Mathers, J McMath and E Hudson

**Comments:**

Visit commenced at the front of the site. Officials showed members the submitted location map and pointed out the location of site, boundaries, position of no 26 and no 24 Atlantic Road, road and lane.

Official explained the refusal reason. Explained that application was submitted as an infill site and therefore fell to be determined under policies CTY1 and 8 of PPS21.

Official quoted CTY8 and advised that CTY8 allows for the development of a small gap sufficient only to accommodate up to a maximum of two houses within an otherwise substantial and continuously built up frontage and provided this respects the existing development pattern and meets other planning and environmental requirements.

Official explained that substantial is defined in the amplification of policy as a line of 3 or more buildings along a frontage and that continuously was without a break. Official also explained that PAC regarded a building to have a frontage to a road if the plot on which it stands abuts or shares a boundary with that road.

Official explained that in this case there is not a substantially and continuously built up frontage. No 26 has a frontage to Atlantic Road. No 24 and its garage have a frontage to the lane. The site has a frontage to the lane. The proposal cannot rely on two frontages. There is no line of 3 or more buildings along a road frontage as required by policy.

The site is therefore not located within a substantially and continuously built up frontage as the development to the north and south have frontages to separate roads and lanes which do not comply with policy.

Official referred to PAC decisions quoted in Committee report and Addendum and PAC position that policy refers to frontage (singular) and not frontages.

Official added that as there was no overriding reason why development is essential it was also contrary to CTY1 of PPS21.

The Official answered questions posed by members about the applicants address, other land in ownership and relevance of Judicial Review at East Road.

J McMath