

# **Addendum**

## **LA01/2016/0459/O**

### **Outline Planning Permission**

#### **Update**

The applicant raised a number of concerns that he feels were not fully addressed in the Committee Report.

- The applicant contends that the proposed dwelling when built would not be skyline.  
Paragraphs 8.27 and 8.28 of the Committee Report discusses the integration of the proposed dwelling. It advises that the dwelling will be skyline when viewed from a westerly direction.
- The applicant advises that as this application has been recommended for refusal he will now need to buy a caravan to live in.  
This is an outline planning application, a reserved matters application would also have to be submitted and approved before development commenced on site. Regardless of the outcome, this application would not provide an immediate housing option.
- That the report did not take into account cost.  
The purpose of planning as outlined in the SPPS is to operate in the public interest. Furthermore, planning does not exist to protect the private interests of one person against the activities of another. The material considerations relevant to this application have been fully considered in the Report.
- That planning policies are inadequate.  
The applicant advises that the policies are inadequate for the residents of Rathlin. As mentioned in paragraph 8.2 additional policy in the Area Plan was provided for residents of Rathlin. This proposal does not meet with this policy. Church Bay was also

designated with a settlement limit and has the potential for more dwellings. Also, as indicated in the Report in paragraphs 8.14 – 8.16 the Council identified two possible suitable sites within the farm business.

- That the applicant runs two businesses.  
The report considered the applicants businesses in paragraphs 8.25 and 8.26.
- That the proposed site does cluster with a group of buildings.  
Clustering has been discussed in the Report in paragraphs 8.10 to 8.11 in relation to Policy CTY 10 (Farm dwelling) and 8.18 to 8.20 in relation to Policy CTY 2a (New dwelling in an existing cluster).  
The dwelling to the north west of the site and the replacement opportunity to the south west are third party dwellings, see location map attached to the Report. As stated in paragraphs 8.11 and 8.19 the dwellings are too far removed from the site to be visually linked. Paragraph 5.41 of Policy CTY 10 prohibits the positioning of a new dwelling with buildings which are on a neighbouring farm holding. As discussed in the aforementioned paragraphs the proposal is not sited to visually link or cluster with the existing farm buildings as required in CTY 10(c) and also does not meet with the clustering policies as outlined in the main report in relation to Policy CTY2a.

No further information has been provided to enable the application to step away from the planning policies discussed in full in the Committee Report. The Conclusions in paragraph 9 of the Committee Report still remain.