

**SITE VISIT REPORT: MONDAY 25<sup>th</sup> October 2021**

*Committee Members: Alderman Baird (Chair), Boyle, Duddy, Finlay, S McKillop and McKeown; Councillors Anderson, Dallat O'Driscoll, Hunter, McGurk, MA McKillop, McLaughlin, McMullan, P McShane (Vice Chair), Nicholl and Scott*

**11.00am**

LA01/2019/0641/O – Site adjacent to and west of 34a Dunlade Road, Greysteel

**App Type: Outline Application**  
**Proposal: Site for dwelling within existing cluster of development infilling of gap site.**

**Present:** Alderman Baird, McKeown, Councillors Hunter, Nicholl and Scott, Official J McMath

**Comments:**

Viewed site from lane. Official explained recommended with refusal to committee in September and was deferred for site visit. Official commenced the meeting by showing the submitted maps by outlining the proposal and identifying the boundaries and viewpoints. Officials outlined that the proposal fell to be determined primarily under CTY2a and CTY8. Officials explained CTY2a makes provision for a dwelling at an existing cluster providing it meets 6 criteria. However, this application failed to meet 3 criteria namely the site was not associated with a focal point such as a social / community building / facility and is not located at a cross roads; insufficient enclosure; does not round off or consolidate but extends development into field. Explained that applicant/agent stated that site is at a cross roads where Dunlade Road crosses road to flax mill /sluice however the lanes off Dunlade Road are laneways to agricultural land or private dwellings. Such lanes are not maintained by Roads and do not meet definition of a road.

Officials explained that CTY8 allows for the development of a small gap within a substantially and continuously built up frontage of development.

Applicant/agents case was that substantial and continuously built up frontage included 4 dwellings on Dunlade Road and buildings on laneway.

Officials pointed out that site shared common frontage with dwellings along lane only and as there was no development at end, there was no gap within which to infill. The site would therefore ribbon development. Dwellings along Dunlade Road did not share a common frontage with application site and

dwellings on Dunlade Road and lane were not visually linked due to topography, separation and vegetation. Members asked if the opinion would be different if proposal had been for entire field and for 2 dwellings. Officials explained that only one dwelling could be applied for under CTY2a and for the purposes of CTY8 the gap must be within continuously built up frontage and applicant was reliant on 2 frontages of development which did not meet policy. Officials explained that site was elevated and prominent, would ribbon development and impact on rural character. Officials advised that NED had requested a Preliminary Ecological Assessment and agent was aware of request but did not wish to put applicant to expense until principle was established.

Walked from site down lane onto Dunlade Road to view laneways. Identified lane accessing agricultural land to east and separate lane to no 33.

J McMath      25/10/2021