

Implementation Date: 01 September 2023

Template for Requesting Speaking Rights at the Planning Committee

The Protocol for the Operation of the Planning Committee provides for interested person(s) to register to speak on a planning application that is scheduled to be determined at the next meeting of the Planning Committee. This request must be received by the Planning Department no later than 10am on the Monday before the Planning Committee meeting via email account planning@causewaycoastandglens.gov.uk.

Planning Reference	LA01/2022/1196/O
Name	Oswald Dallas
Contact Details	Tel: [REDACTED] Email: info@jodassociates.co.uk
Support or Objection – please tick relevant box	Support <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> * Objection <input type="checkbox"/>

Written representation summarising key points to be addressed and supplementary information in support of your case (minimum font size 10 and maximum length two sides of A4 page).

We believe that this application for infill dwelling meets the requirements of Policy CTY8

There is a continuous road frontage and along part of that road frontage is a substantial built-up frontage of 3 buildings with a gap site within capable of accommodating 2 sites for dwellings – one of these sites (site 1) is the subject of the application under consideration here today.

What is road frontage? Policy CTY8 tells us. Under the justification and amplification para. 5.33 - it states: for the purposes of this policy a **road frontage** includes a private lane.

If we can consider the context of our site and its situation.

As you approach the site traveling south on the Atlantic Road towards Coleraine there is **road frontage** on your Right Hand Side. We then veer off (almost straight on actually) on to a laneway where **road frontage** continues on the right hand side. This is continuous road frontage as defined in Policy CTY8.

It is not lane frontage – policy has stated it is road frontage. In the policy wording the term road frontage is only used. It does not differentiate between lane frontage or frontage to a public road.

There are no breaks in this frontage as it continues from public road to laneway.

Within this frontage there exists a substantial built-up frontage of 3 buildings , namely Dwelling at No.24, Garage of No. 24 and Dwelling at 26 Atlantic Road.

Note that all these buildings are addressed as Atlantic Road which further reinforces the fact it a continuous and common frontage.

There is a gap within this frontage which can accommodate 2 infill sites.

Planning argue frontages on to separate roads saying No. 26 is on Atlantic Road but that is not what the Policy states. It does not mention or use the terms 'separate roads' – it only uses the term road frontage which I hope I have explained is what we have here.

Planning state that lands immediately to the south of the site has no development present but of course this is the second infill site which is not the included with this application. We were not required to apply for both sites at the same time.

I am not sure what the point of mentioning the vegetation preventing the sites reading as frontage on to Atlantic is as the sites front the laneway not the Atlantic Road.

If they are referring to not reading with building at No26 Atlantic Road I would refer to the planning appeals case 2013/A0119 where the commissioner held *I quote; 'In any event the term 'visually linked' cannot be directly interpreted as meaning all buildings in the frontage should be visible at once.'*

If I could now turn to the Planning Appeals Case 2016/A0160 which planning department has cited in support of their findings. I fail to see the relevance of this case to our situation. This appeal deals with the situation where a T- junction was deemed to break up the contented substantial road frontage. I do not disagree with this ruling but no such situation is present on our proposal.

Reference was made at the previous Planning Committee meeting to Judicial Review - Ref: NIQB 11, East road, Limavady. Again, the situation and arguments involved in this review are completely different from our application. It is also my understanding that this review was rejected in anycase (*although a further hearing may be heard on appeal*) so why was it put forward as argument against approval.

Our substantially built-up road frontage is continuous with no road or laneway interrupting the frontage. If we were to claim frontage on the other side of the laneway along the Atlantic Road, this of course would be a completely different matter.

This site is set on family farmland now owned jointly by the applicant and his sister. Mr McGarvey, who is present here today, would dearly love to return to live on the farm and re-commence farming. As the original farmhouse and farmyard have long since been sold off this application is his only realistic opportunity for this to happen.

I hope you will agree the proposal by any reasonable assessment meets planning policy. On the ground this line of buildings will read as a substantial and continuous built-up frontage.