Zoning GD 05/11 - Lands between Neill's Lane and Shorelands
(Objections 912, 1873 & 3357)

GHEG claimed that traffic emerging from the zoning would create difficulties for traffic on the road. We note that any proposals are subject to a Transport Assessment and we have not been persuaded that any difficulties could not be overcome. GHEG also claimed that the zoning should be deleted as there has been several occasions of flooding and sewage overflow on the Shore Road. We note that the statutory bodies were consulted during the Plan process and no objections were raised and we are not persuaded by this argument.

We note that a portion of the housing zoning benefits from planning permission subject to conditions and the Department considers that this allows for a satisfactory form of development. We note that development has commenced within the zoning. For the remainder of the site, we refer to our general comments in relation to KSRs. Accordingly, we recommend the deletion of KSRs which require the submission of the following: transport assessment - KSR 4, retention of existing vegetation and the provision of landscape buffers - KSR 7 & 8 flood risk assessment - KSR 9.

It is self evident that overhead power lines exist and these would have to be accommodated as part of the CMP process and therefore reference to these in KSR 12 can be deleted.

Regarding KSR 5, we note that PPS7 refers to development plans being the 'principal vehicle for the identification of any local neighbourhood facilities required as an integral part of the development of zoned housing sites'. The explanatory text relating to QD 1 (d) also refers to the role of the development plan. Technical Supplement 10 states that KSRs are stipulated in the Plan for sites over 15 hectares zoned for housing to ensure the provision of health facilities. A KSR for the provision of a neighbourhood centre on this zoned site is specifically referred to in Technical Supplement 10 (section 5.1.2). The Department’s final position at the Inquiry was that KSR 5 should make reference to a ‘healthy living centre’ rather than ‘a neighbourhood centre’ and that there should be no size requirement. No explanation was provided as to what exactly constitutes a ‘healthy living centre’ and no specific proposals for same were put forward. We note, however, the general support from NHSSB for a ‘healthy living centre’ in response to a specific consultation for this zoning.

Irrespective of facilities currently available in Greenisland, the scale of the site, its location at the edge of the settlement and the support for health provision from the Board persuade us that a KSR is necessary. We therefore do not agree with the objector that the 5th KSR should be deleted or entirely left to the development management process. In the absence of a firm proposal for health provision, we disagree with the Department that specific reference should be made to a ‘healthy living centre’. Reference to 'local
neighbourhood facilities’ would allow greater flexibility at the development management stage and would encompass health provision if required.

Given the Department’s comments at the Inquiry and the fact that the site is just in excess of the 15 ha threshold, we agree that 1.5 hectares is excessive, but consider that a figure needs to be set out for clarity. We judge that 0.5 hectares would be sufficient for the provision of neighbourhood facilities in this case.

**Recommendation**

We recommend:

- deletion of the following KSRs: 4, 7, 8, 9 and 12.
- KSR 5 should be amended to read, 'Provision shall be made within the proposed development for local neighbourhood facilities on approximately 0.5 hectares.'