

**PLANNING APPEALS COMMISSION**

**The Planning (Northern Ireland) Order 1991**

**Article 7**

**EXAMINATION IN PUBLIC INTO OBJECTIONS TO THE  
DRAFT NORTHERN AREA PLAN 2016**

**SECTION 2**

**REPORT ON BALLYMONEY BOROUGH COUNCIL AREA**

**Report by**

**Commissioners G Scott, R Daly and D O'Neill**

**Examination Dates: 19 September – 6 October 2011  
23 January – 22 March 2012**

**Date of Report: 4 June 2014**

**CONTENTS****Ballymoney Borough Council**

2.1	Ballymoney	1
2.2	Ballybogy	16
2.3	Balnamore	20
2.4	Cloghmills	24
2.5	Dervock	29
2.6	Dunloy	35
2.7	Loughguile	39
2.8	Rasharkin	42
2.9	Stranocum	46
2.10	Small Settlements:	48
	Bendooragh	48
	Bushvale	49
	Carneatly	49
	Corkey	50
	Derrykeighan	51
	Dunaghy	52
	Finvoy	54
	Magherahoney	56
2.11	Ballymoney Countryside	57

## **2.1 BALLYMONEY**

### **HOUSING**

- 2.1.1 Ballymoney is the only town within Ballymoney District. As directed by the RDS, the Draft NAP identifies Ballymoney as a local hub in recognition of its function within the settlement hierarchy. Designation BY01 proposes a Settlement Development Limit (SDL) and is identified on Map No.2/01a.

#### **Plan Provision for Housing**

- 2.1.2 Taking account of the 2008 HGI revision for Ballymoney District the draft plan makes provision for 1877 housing units in Ballymoney town. Between January 1999 and August 2010, 1159 housing units were completed. The Department's housing update paper (March 2011) estimates that approximately 2832 housing units could be accommodated within the settlement over the plan period; this is a surplus of 955 units (50.9%) above the plan allocation. It is projected that this would provide a future land supply in excess of 15 years.

#### **Social Housing**

- 2.1.3 The Department's Housing Update Paper (March 2011) states that the social housing need within Ballymoney town is 10 over the next 7 years (2010-2017); no social housing need was identified in 2004. Given the relatively modest level of need identified, we are satisfied that there is no need for additional land to be identified within the SDL to meet social housing needs.

#### **Phasing**

- 2.1.4 Section one of this report has already addressed the issue of phasing; as a result, phase 1 and phase 2 housing zonings have equal status. We therefore recommend that all references to phasing be removed from the plan.

#### **Settlement Development Limit (SDL)**

- 2.1.5 In section one of this report, we concluded that there is no strategic need to allocate further housing land within Ballymoney town. Given the generous level of housing land supply, we do not accept the objectors' arguments that the proposed settlement is too restrictive to accommodate the town's housing requirements over the plan period. We therefore do not support the objections seeking the expansion of the settlement development limit or the re-inclusion of land previously within the SDL of NEAP. Any extension of the SDL or zoning of additional housing land will only be recommended where we are satisfied that there are urban form arguments or other factors that would justify an exception being made. It is therefore on this basis that we will assess the site specific objections which are seeking the expansion of the SDL of Ballymoney and the zoning of additional housing land within the settlement.

## **Sites Outside the Settlement Development Limit**

### ***Sites of a size not required for housing***

- 2.1.6 Objection 5755 requested the inclusion and zoning for housing and associated and ancillary development of land on the **north-western side of the settlement and on the northern side of the Frosses Road**. The Frosses Road acts as a natural physical barrier that defines and contains the settlement and no further development should therefore breach it. Development of this extensive area would result in urban sprawl into what is also a highly sensitive area, which the presence of the proposed LLPA designation BYL01 and Leslie Hill HPG demonstrate. There is no justification for the inclusion of this land within the SDL.
- 2.1.7 A number of objections were received seeking the inclusion of land for housing or whiteland within the proposed development limit. These are considered in a clockwise basis, commencing with objections in the north-west of the settlement between Macfin Road and Ballybogy Road.

### ***North-west Ballymoney***

- 2.1.8 Objections 4521 and 4613 requested the inclusion of the area **opposite No.128 Newbridge Road and west and south-west of No.129 (Hilden) Newbridge Road**. Objection 4613 also requested the inclusion of land **including and surrounding No.129 (Hilden) Newbridge Road**. This area on the outskirts of Ballymoney, located within the proposed LLPA BYL 01 designation, has a rural character and forms an attractive entrance/exit to the settlement. It also contributes to the views and setting of Leslie Hill HPG. This area is removed from the proposed settlement limit and housing development located here, even if at a low density, would appear divorced from the town; it would create an illogical settlement form. We therefore do not agree that the junction of Newbridge and Frosses Road is a natural cut off point for the settlement. Despite the various arguments presented to support the objections, given that it does not represent limited rounding off or infilling of the settlement's form, we conclude that it should remain outside the settlement limit.
- 2.1.9 Objections 291, 330, 4613, 4857, 5060, 5429, 5463 and 5755 requested the inclusion of land **west of Beckett Drive, including Knowehead (No.189 Seacon Road), west of No.128a Newbridge Road and No.128 Newbridge Road**. Objections 291, 4613, 4857 and 5755 also sought the inclusion of land further **west and including No.126 Newbridge Road** up to the **junction of Newbridge and Frosses Road**. The lands appear divorced from the settlement form and contribute to presenting an attractive entrance/exit for the settlement when approaching or leaving it from the north-westerly direction. The inclusion of any of these lands would result in unacceptable sprawling of the settlement's form in a north-westerly direction and represents an intrusion into the open countryside. The exclusion of this land from the SDL is endorsed.

**South-east Ballymoney**

- 2.1.10 Objection 4973 requested that land located **at the junction of Frosses and Ballybogey Roads, north-west of the Portrush roundabout**, be identified as a tourism development opportunity site; it was envisaged that it could accommodate a travel lodge type of development. Despite the accessibility of the location along a main route that leads to the North Coast area, a lack of substantive evidence was presented to demonstrate a specific need for such a proposal at this location. Such a proposition would best be considered through the development management process, when the full details of the proposal could be scrutinised and assessed. Located on the rural side of the Frosses Road, away from the urban form and on a relatively open site, development on this site would appear somewhat divorced from the main urban form of Ballymoney. Given its location between two protected routes, its development may also have implications for road safety and the free movement of traffic.
- 2.1.11 Objections 330, 5181, 5731 and 5763 requested that land **adjacent and south-east of housing zoning BYH 11, off Old Ballymena Road**, be included within the proposed development limit and zoned for housing. Despite the numerous arguments presented by the objectors, there is however no strategic need for additional housing land to be included within the proposed settlement limit. We conclude that the land should remain outside the SDL.
- 2.1.12 Objection 5459 sought the inclusion of land **adjacent to the Millbrook Resource Centre, Ballymena Road**; they requested that it be included within the proposed development limit and zoned for housing. Given that this land is divorced from the proposed SDL, to include it would require the inclusion of intervening land which is not the subject of objection. If housing were located here, it would result in the unacceptable sprawling of the urban form in an easterly direction. We therefore do not support the inclusion of this land within the SDL.
- 2.1.13 Objection 408's description of the location of the objection site '**adjacent to zoned housing site BYH 11 along the Ballymoney Road**' does not correspond with the area highlighted on the map accompanying the objection, which indicates the site as being within industrial zoning BYI 03 **opposite Windsor Gardens, Garryduff Road**. Given this discrepancy, it is not possible to identify with any certainty which area the objector was intending to object to. A potential counter-objector may not have been clear what area the objection related to. At any rate, no evidence was provided to justify setting aside the industrial zoning in favour of housing and we have already concluded above that the land adjacent to BYH 11 should not be taken within the SDL.
- 2.1.14 Objections 330, 4915, 4928, 4945, 5183, 5429 and 5527 requested that land located **between Finvoy, Bravellen and Raceview/Garryduff Road** be included within the limit and/or be zoned for residential use. DNAP proposed that some of this land, while located outside the SDL, be zoned for recreational use (BYO 01). However, as will be discussed later in this report, this is no longer the case and at the EiP the Department suggested that the land be left unzoned and outside the proposed development limit. Whilst these lands are located relatively close to the town centre of Ballymoney, they still retain their rural character and their inclusion would result in the sprawling of the

settlement form into the countryside in a south-westerly direction. The various arguments presented by the objectors are therefore not determining in this instance. There should be no change to the Plan as a result of these objections.

- 2.1.15 Objection 5214 sought the inclusion of lands **south of No.9 Bravallen Road and surrounding and including No.21 Bravallen Road**. The two areas of land are divorced and isolated, requiring the inclusion of additional lands, not the subject of objection, in order to be adjacent to the proposed development limit. Their inclusion would result in the unacceptable sprawling of the urban form in a southerly direction. We do not support the inclusion of this land within the SDL.
- 2.1.16 Objection 5183 requested that land **south-east of Mill Grange, Finvoy Road** be included within the proposed development limit and allocated for development purposes. The objector suggested that uses such a retirement village could be located here, however, little substantive evidence was presented to support this proposition. There is no strategic need for further land to be included within the proposed development limit for residential purposes. The exclusion of this land from the SDL is endorsed.

#### ***Ballymoney south and west***

- 2.1.17 Objection 5429 requested that land **south-west of Bannview Park, Bann Road** be included within the development limit and be zoned for housing. To include this land would result in the further sprawling of the settlement in a south-westerly direction along Bann Road and would not contribute to achieving a compact urban form. Despite the presence of a farmhouse and outbuildings on a portion of the land and numerous arguments in relation to its locational advantages, these factors do not overcome the identified concerns in relation to the objection. This land should not be included within the SDL.
- 2.1.18 Objection 5527 requested that **land on either side of Bann Road, east of No.42 Bann Road**, be included within the proposed development limit and be zoned for housing purposes. The inclusion of this relatively open land would result in the unacceptable sprawling of the settlement into the open countryside in a south-westerly direction. We do not support the inclusion of this land within the SDL.
- 2.1.19 Objections 330 and 5763 objected to the fact that lands **south-west of Bannfield, Bann Road** were not included within the proposed settlement limit and zoned for housing purposes. As this site is being developed (D/2005/0992/F), having been allowed on appeal on 02/03/05 (D/2004/0451/O), there is little benefit leaving it outside the proposed development limit. While there is no need to zone it for housing, since the site is already being developed, we recommend that the SDL be adjusted to include this site within it.
- 2.1.20 Objection 4953 requested the inclusion and zoning for housing of land **including, west and south of No.44 Ballybrakes Road**. The land is divorced from the proposed development limit, with its nearest zoning being an area designated for industrial use (BYI 01). Despite the presence of existing farm

dwellings and outbuildings on the site, significant housing here would appear isolated from the urban form. Given the open nature of the land, development here would not tie in easily with the existing urban form.

- 2.1.21 Objection 5316 requested the inclusion of land **opposite No.44 Ballybrakes Road, between Ballybrakes Road and Ballymoney River**. There are a number of constraints with this land including the proposed LLPA designation BYL 02 in the northern portion. The main Belfast railway line also runs through the site and it is difficult to envisage how it would be feasibly developed. In addition, any development of the land would appear isolated and divorced from the settlement given the lack of significant other development around the site. It would result in the encroaching of the settlement into the countryside on its western approach and is appropriately excluded from the settlement limit.
- 2.1.22 Objections **330 and 5183** requested that land **south-west of housing zoning BYH 10 and north of Industrial Designation BYI 01, Ballybrakes Road** be included within the proposed settlement limit. Objection 330 also asked that the land be zoned for housing purposes. Located along the banks of the Ballymoney River, this site contributes to the river corridor which is proposed to be designated as part of LLPA BYL 02. There may also be the risk of flooding on the site. Access may prove problematic as there is no direct access onto a road.
- 2.1.23 Objections 330, 4722, 5060 and 5763 requested the inclusion and zoning for housing of land on **Balnamore Road, west of The Meadows, Charlotte Street**. The inclusion of this land would expand the settlement beyond the attractive mature treed boundary located along the eastern site boundary which defines the proposed settlement limit. The land also provides an attractive setting for Ballymoney River corridor, hence its suggested inclusion within designation BYL 02, which is located along the southern boundary of the site. Given the proximity of Ballymoney River, and the evidence of the flood map provided by the Department, it is clear that this land may also be prone to flooding. Development of this land would encroach out into the open countryside, beyond the natural form of the settlement. The exclusion of this land from the SDL is justified and is endorsed.
- 2.1.24 Objections 330, 4722 and 5060 requested the inclusion and zoning for housing of land **west of Drumnamallagh Close, Balnamore Road**. With no accompanying development to the north, south or west, its inclusion would result in the unacceptable sprawling of the settlement in a westerly direction. Given the contribution that the land makes to the Leslie Hill Estate and that it is located within the Leslie Hill HPG, we concur with the Department's suggestion that it should also be included within LLPA Designation BYL 01. We conclude that this land should not be included within the SDL.
- 2.1.25 Objections 330, 4722, 5060 and 5763 sought the inclusion and zoning for housing of land **north of Drumnamallagh Road**. Given that the Department has indicated that this site is being developed for residential purposes, objections to its exclusion from the SDL would seem to have been superseded by subsequent events. At the EiP the Department indicated that they propose to amend the Leslie Hill HPG boundary to exclude this site from within its boundaries. As the Department is satisfied that development has commenced

on the site, the development limit should be amended to include this land. Given that development has commenced, there is however no need to zone it for proposed housing use.

### **Recommendations**

#### **2.1.26 We recommend that:**

- **Land south-west of Bannfield, Bann Road be included within the proposed settlement development limit.**
- **Land north of Drumnamallagh Road be included within the proposed settlement development limit.**

#### **Objections seeking the Zoning of Land for Housing Within the Settlement Development Limit.**

2.1.27 Objection 5057 requested that the dwelling and associated curtilage at No. 103 Charlotte Street, which is **adjacent to housing zoning BYH 16**, be zoned for residential purposes. In addition to the fact that the site does not abut a public road, there is no need to zone additional land for residential purposes. Objections 285 and 5086 sought that lands at **Armour Avenue** be zoned for housing use. This land has been designated as existing open space, however as will be examined later in the report, we recommend that this designation be removed from the said land. No substantive evidence was presented to support the request for the land to be zoned for residential purposes and there is also no need for additional housing land to be zoned within the proposed settlement limit given the potential generous housing provision. No persuasive evidence was presented by objection 5112 to support their request that the lands at the **'Paints and Components' shop, Seymour Street** be zoned for housing. The Department indicated that these lands are mostly being used for existing employment purposes and we agree that it would be inappropriate to zone these for residential use, especially as there is no need for additional land to be designated.

### **HOUSING ZONINGS**

2.1.28 The draft plan proposes a number of house zonings. The main issues raised in objections to those zonings relate to:

- (a) Inadequacy of residential opportunities;
- (b) Potential problems caused by their overlapping with other designations;
- (c) Their lack of suitability; and
- (d) Appropriateness of the key site requirements

#### **Inadequacy of zonings**

2.1.29 Objection 330 objected to all of the proposed housing zonings in the draft plan stating that they were inadequate in terms of providing residential opportunities for the future. Given the generous extent of housing opportunities in Ballymoney's proposed settlement limit, we do not accept this generic claim.

### **Overlapping with other designations**

- 2.1.30 Where the proposed housing zoning overlapped with a LLPA designation, objection 330 claimed that this was confusing and unacceptable due to the restrictive impact that LLPAs may have on the potential housing yield from a site. This objection was unsubstantiated with supporting evidence and the Department indicated in their evidence that some of these sites have already been completed or have been granted planning permission for residential purposes. The appropriateness of development within a LLPA will depend on the specific LLPA and would be best assessed as part of the development management process.

#### BYH 14

- 2.1.31 Given that housing zoning BYH 14 has extant planning permission granted on 13<sup>th</sup> April 2010 for residential development (D/2008/0239/F), we are not persuaded by objection 330's unsubstantiated claims that the identification of this area as an Area of Archaeological Potential and its partial location within the town's Conservation Area are confusing, misleading or contravene the purpose of zoning land for housing. Given this extant permission, we also do not support objection 4406's unsubstantiated request that the site be rezoned as a Development Opportunity Site suitable for retail, commercial and residential purposes.

#### BYH 17-20 and BYH 30

- 2.1.32 In relation to housing zonings BYH 17-20 inclusive and BYH 30, objection 330 failed to substantiate how policies applicable in these housing zonings would have an adverse impact on the potential yield from the sites. In accordance with the principles set out in Paragraph 39 of PPS 1, the identification of a site within an Area of Archaeological Potential serves to alert potential developers as to the possible presence of archaeological remains and the need to liaise with the Department. At any rate, the Department indicated that housing zonings BYH 18 and BYH 19 are already committed for development.

### **Lack of suitability**

#### BYH 01

- 2.1.33 Objection 5058 raised concern about the suitability of the site for residential purposes given the possibility of contamination and suggested that it should be zoned for commercial use. The Department confirmed that the site is already in commercial use and should therefore no longer be considered as a housing zoning. We agree with that conclusion and recommend that the housing zoning be removed from the site. We note that the removal of the site has already been accounted for in the Department's housing calculation.

#### BYH 09

- 2.1.34 In relation to housing zoning BYH 09, the Department indicated at the EiP that they propose to remove this housing zoning from this site as there is a current application to refurbish the former school building on the site. This would seem

to address objectors 4667 and 5757 concerns in relation to the potential loss of a building of interest within Ballymoney's Conservation Area. The zoning should therefore be removed.

### BYH 23

- 2.1.35 As the site of housing zoning BYH 23 is accepted by the Department to be in commercial use, we agree with objection 5056 that the housing zoning should be deleted from the site. Given the site's proximity to Ballymoney town centre, however, we do not concur with objection's unsubstantiated request that the site be zoned as a local centre.

### BYH 25

- 2.1.36 No substantive evidence was presented by objection 5183 to support their claim that housing zoning BYH 25 will not make a contribution to the housing provision in Ballymoney and therefore should be de-zoned. The zoning should remain in place.

## **Appropriateness of the KSRs**

### BYH 10

- 2.1.37 Objection 5183 objected to the KSRs in relation to housing zoning BYH 10. They did not, however, elaborate how these could be amended. It is noted that the Department have indicated that this site is committed having received planning approval on 6<sup>th</sup> July 2011 for a Reserved Matters proposal (D/2008/0097/RM), which meets all the KSRs. As the plan cannot override the provisions of an extant permission the KSRs should be removed from the zoning.

### BYH 19

- 2.1.38 Objection 5143 objected to KSR No.2 of housing zoning BYH 19 stipulating that the access should be via John Street. Given that the site has already been developed, there is no further need for this KSR.

### BYH 21

- 2.1.39 Given the granting of planning permission on 6<sup>th</sup> November 2008 (D/2006/0028/F) for residential development on the site of housing zoning BYH 21, the Department indicated in their evidence that the housing zoning should consequently be extended to include the area of land now approved. We concur with this position and this would overcome objection 4842's request for additional land to be included within the zoning.

### BYH 24

- 2.1.40 Given that the Department have indicated that housing zoning BYH 24 is now complete, objection 4835's objection to specific KSRs and their request that the zoning be extended to include additional lands has been superseded by

subsequent events. Given that the site has already been developed, there is no further need for the KSRs.

#### BYH 26

2.1.41 Objection 4910 objected to a number of the KSRs of Housing Zoning BYH 26. As the Department have indicated that this site is committed and development seems to be underway, the Plan cannot override the provisions of an extant planning permission. The KSRs can therefore be removed.

#### BYH 42

2.1.42 As the Department is satisfied that development is underway on housing zoning BYH 42, objection 5183's objection to the site's KSRs has been superseded by subsequent events. There is therefore no further need for the KSRs.

#### Recommendations

2.1.43 We recommend that:

- **Housing zonings BYH 01, BYH09 and BYH 23 be deleted from the plan.**
- **Housing zoning BYH 21 should be extended to reflect the extent of planning permission D/2006/0028/F.**
- **The KSRs should be removed from Housing Zonings BYH 10, BYH 19, BYH 24, BYH 26 and BYH 42.**

#### **INDUSTRY, BUSINESS AND DISTRIBUTION**

2.1.44 Objection 330 objected to all of Ballymoney's industrial designations and zonings while objection 5185 also objected to Industrial Designation BYI 01. As Industrial Designations BYI 01 and BYI 02 are existing industrial sites, their identification is for information purposes only. We have already concluded at a strategic level that there is more than adequate industrial land zoned for Ballymoney. There should be no changes to the Plan as a result of these objections.

#### **OPEN SPACE AND OUTDOOR RECREATION**

2.1.45 Objections 285 and 5086 requested that land at **Armour Avenue**, which is in residential use, should not be identified as part of a major area of existing open space. Whilst this identification is for information purposes only, given the site's residential use and the fact that it appears divorced from the rest of the open space, we recommend that this area no longer be identified as part of this major area of existing open space.

2.1.46 At the EiP, the Department indicated that due to the fact that Ballymoney Borough Council no longer have an interest in open space zoning BY0 01, they

propose to revert this area back to being unzoned land located outside the development limit within the rural remainder. Given that there is a surplus of over 30ha of outdoor playing space within the town, we concur with the suggestion to remove the open space zoning (15.49ha). Whether or not this land should be included within the proposed settlement development limit for development purposes was considered earlier in the report. The removal of this zoning would therefore overcome objections 330, 4353, 4563, 4945 and 5183 various objections to open space zoning BYO 01.

### **Recommendations**

#### **2.1.47 We recommend that:**

- **Open space zoning BYO 01 be removed.**
- **Land at Armour Avenue (objections 285 and 5086) be removed from the major area of existing open space identified on Map No. 2/01a-Ballymoney**

### **AREA OF ARCHAEOLOGICAL POTENTIAL**

2.1.48 Objection 330 raised concern in relation to the expansive nature of the Area of Archaeological Potential (AAP) and how it would inhibit development. The AAP is shown for information purposes to highlight to potential developers that the area may contain archaeological remains and therefore they are advised to liaise with the Department prior to submitting a proposal within this area. No general assumption can therefore be made that the potential presence of such matters will inhibit development. There should be no change to the Plan as a result of this objection.

### **TOWN CENTRE AND DEVELOPMENT OPPORTUNITY SITES**

#### **BYT 01**

2.1.49 No substantive evidence was provided by objection 330 as to why they consider the town centre designation BYT 01 to be too restrictive and inhibiting its revitalisation. In relation to the presence of the AAP within BYT 01 and 02 and the Conservation Area, the AAP is shown for information purposes to highlight to potential developers that the area may contain archaeological remains. They are therefore advised to liaise with the Department prior to submitting a proposal within this area. In terms of the presence of the Conservation Area, this is the designation of an area of special architectural or historic interest, the character or appearance of which it is desirable to preserve or enhance. An assumption cannot be made that the potential presence of such areas will automatically inhibit development. At any rate, the Conservation Area boundary has already been determined under separate legislation. In relation to objection 4406, the Department have stated that an updated OS map will be used when the plan is adopted and they propose that the Tesco site should be fully included within the town centre boundary. We concur with this suggestion, which would overcome the objector's concern. No substantive evidence was provided by objection 4406 as to why lands off

Seymour Street should be included within the town centre and identified as a DOS for retail, residential and commercial use.

- 2.1.50 Objection 5124 did not provide a map to demonstrate how they would propose that the town centre boundary should be extended. The objection however requested that the existing retail and commercial units on Queen Street, Market Street and on Model School Road be included as well as North Antrim College of Further and Higher Education. We empathise with the Department's position that whilst the college and the properties on Model School Road may be compatible with the town centre, they have drawn the boundary tightly in order to focus investment in the heart of the centre, in parts in need of regeneration. Whilst the specific extent of the objection is unknown, to expand in these general areas could result in the unnecessary sprawling of the town centre and necessitate the inclusion of a number of residential properties. We do not support this objection.
- 2.1.51 Objection 5757 objected to the phrasing of the policy within Paragraph 8.2 ((Vol.2, part 4, para 8.2, p.16) which relates to the Department's wish to exclude significant groups of housing from the town centre. Within town centres, the emphasis in regional policy is on retail and maintaining and promoting a compact and attractive shopping environment (Paragraph 23, PPS5). Whilst Paragraph 27 of PPS 5: Retailing and Town Centres acknowledges that residential development within town centres can contribute to its vitality, this specifically refers to LOTS where the primary retail core and commercial functions of the town centre are not prejudiced. Therefore, although town centre living is promoted by regional planning policy in order to encourage the development of 'walkable communities', there would appear to be little benefit to include significant housing areas within the town centre. We are though satisfied that regional policy, through Policy HS 1 Living Over the Shop within PPS 12: Housing in Settlements and Paragraph 27 in PPS 5 will continue to allow for residential uses above commercial properties and that such proposals can be assessed as part of the development management system. We are satisfied that designation BYT 01 does not require amendment.

#### BYT 02

- 2.1.52 Objections 4667 and 5757 did not substantiate their objection to the inclusion of what they considered to be a 'good unlisted terrace' within Development Opportunity Site BYT 02. Objection 4667 sought the Conservation Area to be extended or the area to be designated as an ATC and for the buildings to be restored whilst objection 5757 stated that the sensitive restoration of the terrace should be a prerequisite of the development. Given the general appearance and condition of buildings along Linenhall Street, which it is assumed the objector is referring to, we do not agree that the area is worthy of being excluded from the zoning, of designation as part of an ATC, or that its retention should be a prerequisite of the development of the site. The extent of the Conservation Area boundary is established under separate legislation and is shown in the plan for information purposes only. It is not a matter that we can address. Objections 5581 and 5613 sought the expansion of zoning BYT 02, considering it to be too restrictive thus preventing the area's comprehensive development. We concur with the Department's position that the identification of this area may not necessarily prevent proposals coming forward which seek

to expand the area; these can be assessed as part of the development management process. Rather than being unduly onerous, we consider the zoning's KSRs to be reasonable and appropriate given the context of the site. As indicated early within the strategic transportation section of this report, the impact of the proposed cycle network and the Charles Street Protected Route on the redevelopment of the site are matters which are beyond the remit of this plan.

### BYT 03

- 2.1.53 Objection 330 did not substantiate why the Opportunity Site proposed under BYT 03 should be included within Ballymoney Town Centre, as proposed under designation BYT 01. Whilst the objection site is located adjacent to the proposed town centre designation, we are satisfied that the retail centre does not need to be enlarged at this location and that inclusion of the objection site would fail to promote a compact retail environment. We note that the KSRs for BYT 03 allow for a high density housing scheme or commercial development including warehousing and offices. Such uses are appropriate on this highly accessible site, but are not necessarily suitable within the town centre retail area. At the EIP the Department proposed to alter KSR No.2 to say that 'retail warehousing with units of not less than 1000 square metres gross floorspace' will be acceptable on this site. Previously the threshold indicated was 900 square metres gross floorspace. We concur with this suggestion, which addresses the concern of objection 5613.

### Recommendations

#### 2.1.54 We recommend that:

- **The delineation of the OS map for BYT 01 should be updated to reflect the full extent of the Tesco development and its associated car parking area.**
- **KSR No.2 of BYT 03 should be amended to read that '*...units not less than 1000 square metres gross floorspace...*' will be acceptable.**

### **BALLYMONEY CONSERVATION AREA**

- 2.1.55 Objection 5581 requested that the Conservation Area Boundary be amended in order to exclude properties at **High Street/Linenhall Street**. The Conservation Area boundary, however, is not a plan proposal. As stated within Paragraph 38 of PPS 1, such designations are not open for public debate through the plan process and are indicated purely for information purposes.

### **BALLYMONEY LOCAL CENTRE**

- 2.1.56 Objection 330 failed to substantiate why commercial designation BYLC 01 does not accurately reflect the area required to be covered by such a designation. There should be no change to the Plan as a result of this objection.

## TRANSPORTATION AND CAR PARKING

- 2.1.57 If the proposed development limit were to be substantially expanded in a southerly direction, objection 5613 sought the identification of a southern link relief road. The necessity and suitability of such an expansion was assessed earlier in this report and, as stated within the strategic transportation section of the report, it is beyond the remit of the plan to identify such a road. Any substantial development proposal however would be assessed as part of the development management process which may include a transportation assessment. Objection 330 failed to substantiate why proposed car park zoning BYP 01, which seeks to provide substitute parking for the potential loss of existing public parking along the Townhead Street frontage to accommodate proposal BYH 17 for housing, does not accurately reflect the area required to be covered by such a designation. In the absence of any clarification on this point we are not in a position to comment further.

## ENVIRONMENTAL DESIGNATIONS

- 2.1.58 Objections 330, 4857, 5056, 5057, 5060, 5092, 5316, 5463, 5755 and 5763 either questioned the extent and need for some or all of the LLPA designations located within or in proximity to Ballymoney town, or requested that specific areas of land be excluded from the designations. Objection 330 also questioned the purpose in overlapping these with green belt or housing designations. None of these general concerns were however spelt out in detail or in a manner that would allow us to consider them more critically. It should, however, be noted that green belts are no longer in existence within the plan area and, as a result, at the EiP the Department proposed to delete Paragraph 12.2 to reflect this and to make reference to the fact that PPS 21 now contains the applicable regional policy guidance.

### BYL 01

- 2.1.59 No substantive evidence was presented by objection 5613 to elaborate or explain why they consider that the lands off Balnamore Road should be included within the proposed Leslie Hill LLPA (BYL 01). That said, given that the roadside field located on Balnamore Road, west of Drumnamallaght Road, remains undeveloped and is within Leslie Hill HPG, the Department acknowledged that there would be merit in including this field within BYL 01. Due to the contribution of this land to the views and setting of Leslie Hill demesne, we concur with the Department's suggestion. We however agree with the Department that the other lands identified in this locality by objection 5613 should remain outside the designation, the Department having conceded that development has commenced on site and that it should be incorporated within the SDL.
- 2.1.60 Whilst the lands between Frosses Road and Newbridge Road may not be part of the Leslie Hill estate, we do not accept the claim by objection 291 that this is featureless farmland and that this area should be excluded from the proposed LLPA designation BYL 01. In our view this area and its associated planting serve to contain the settlement and present an attractive entrance/exit to the town, thus contributing to the views and setting of Ballymoney. The retention of trees as part of a sensitive development proposal would not justify the omission

of this area from BYL 01. Objection 4613's argument that sensitively designed housing development should not be prevented on lands at Newbridge Road was assessed earlier in this report.

### BYL 02

- 2.1.61 Objections 5092 and 5183 argued that existing planning policy could ensure that development within the private garden and south-west of No.20 The Meadows would not have an adverse effect on the character of the area and that it should be removed from the LLPA designation proposed in BYL 02. Paragraph 2.23 within PPS 6, however, states that river banks can be a landscape feature within or adjoining settlements considered to be worthy of protection from undesirable or damaging development by including it within a LLPA designation. Little persuasive evidence was presented why this area should be excluded from BYL 02. In terms of objection 5183 concern in relation to part of housing zoning BYH 42 being included within BYL 02, we concur with the Department's suggestion that given the planning approvals for residential development granted on the site (D/2004/0973/O, D/2009/0297/RM and D/2009/0298/RM) and their acknowledgement that development has already commenced on the site, it would be logical for designation BYL 02 to be reduced at this location in order to reflect the area of proposed open space proposed by the approved planning applications. No persuasive evidence was presented by objection 5183 to demonstrate why this stretch of the river corridor should not be protected. Therefore whilst we agree that the extent of designation BYL 02 should be reduced, the LLPA should still remain in place along the river corridor as suggested. No substantive evidence was presented by objection 5183 to justify why the land south-west of housing zoning BYH 10 should be excluded from BYL 02.

### BYL 03

- 2.1.62 Despite the argument by objection 326 that as the land on Meeting House Street opposite Cockpit Brae has planning permission for housing development, it should be excluded from BYL 03, no substantive evidence was presented as to why this should be the case. Likewise, Objection 4842 gives little substantive detail as to why they consider that the area of BYH 21 and around Rodeing Foot and the Methodist Church make little contribution to the visual amenity of the LLPA and river corridor. Objection 5086 argued that development can be controlled by existing and emerging planning policy, without the necessity of designating an area as a LLPA. The area identified is however not located within any LLPA designation.

### BYL 05

- 2.1.63 Objection 5424 objected to the inclusion of land to the south and east of No.81 Kilraghts Road within BYL 05 Greenville LLPA. In actual fact, the said land is not located within any LLPA designation.

BYL 06

- 2.1.64 In relation to BYL 06, the Department indicated at the EiP that they are going to delete housing zoning BYH 09. Objection 5613 stated at the EiP that this would overcome their objection.

Leslie Hill HPG

- 2.1.65 Objection 330 questioned the extent and purpose of designating Leslie Hill Park, Garden and Demesne on land which they stated was built on or previously zoned for housing. Given that this objection and those from objections 5060 and 5763 were unsubstantiated we do not support these objections. It is however noted that the Department submitted a map (Map No.2/45) at the EiP to illustrate that they propose to reduce the extent of the Leslie Hill HPG designation and we concur with this suggestion.

Recommendations**2.1.66 We recommend that:**

- **Land located to the west of Drumnamallagh Close, Balmore Road be included within LLPA Designation BYL 01.**
- **The extent of BYL 02 should be reduced to reflect the area of open space proposed by the approved planning applications on BYH 42.**
- **The extent of Leslie Hill HPG designation should be reduced to that illustrated at the EIP on Map No.2/45**

## 2.2 BALLYBOGY

### Provision for Housing and the Settlement Development Limit

- 2.2.1 Ballybogy was designated as a hamlet within the North East Area Plan (NEAP) however, given its level of growth, it is now proposed as a village within the Draft Northern Area Plan (dNAP). Designation BB01 proposes a Settlement Development Limit (SDL) for Ballybogy and this is identified on Map No. 2/02.
- 2.2.2 Taking account of the 2008 HGI revision for Ballymoney District the draft plan makes provision for 36 housing units in Ballybogy. However, between January 1999 and August 2010 144 units were completed. The Department's housing update paper (March 2011) estimates that approximately 153 housing units could be accommodated within the settlement limit over the plan period; this would amount to a surplus of approximately 117 units (325%) above the plan allocation.

### Social Housing

- 2.2.3 The Department's Housing Update Paper (March 2011) states that there is no social housing need within Ballybogy over the next 7 years (2010-2017).

### Settlement Development Limit (SDL)

- 2.2.4 In section one of this report, we concluded that there is no strategic need to allocate further housing land within Ballybogy. Given the generous level of housing land supply, we do not accept the objectors' arguments that the proposed settlement is too restrictive to accommodate the village's housing requirements over the plan period. We therefore do not support the objections seeking the expansion of the settlement development limit or the re-inclusion of land previously within the SDL of NEAP. Any extension of the SDL will only be recommended where we are satisfied that there are urban form arguments or other factors that would justify an exception being made. It is therefore on this basis that we will assess the site specific objections which are seeking the expansion of the SDL of Ballybogy.

### Sites Outside the Settlement Development Limit

- 2.2.5 A number of objections were received seeking the inclusion of land for housing or whiteland within the proposed development limit. Objections 283 and 5114 sought the inclusion of lands **between and north of No.6 Heagles Road and the junction of Heagles Road and Ballybogy Road** and lands **south of No.87 Ballybogy Road and north-east of No.6 Heagles Road**. This extensive area is relatively flat however due to the low boundary screening, development here would appear prominent at the entrance/exit to the settlement. To include this land would significantly elongate the settlement in a southerly direction, resulting in urban sprawl.
- 2.2.6 Objections 312 and 5522 requested that lands **north and north-west of Meadowbrook housing development, Ballybogy Road** and lands **west of No.108 Ballybogy Road** fronting onto Ballyrashane Road and **south-west of the junction of Ballyrashane and Ballybogy Roads** be included within the

proposed development limit for housing and mixed use purposes. There is no need for such an extensive expansion of the settlement for residential purposes. Whilst the objections claimed that the lands could also provide social housing, no need for such housing was identified by NIHE and no persuasive evidence was presented to support the claim that there is a housing affordability issue within Ballybogy. Little substantive evidence was provided to support the claim that other mixed uses should be located on the lands. Given the status of Ballybogy as a village, it is also not considered appropriate to zone this land for industrial or employment purposes. To include the lands located along the Ballyrashane Road and at its junction with Ballybogy Road would result in an expansive elongation of the settlement in a northerly direction and appear as urban sprawl. Development here would appear prominent in the landscape due to its scale and degree of elevation. The fact that there were not other Option C submissions at the Public Examination is of little consequence as all objections are given the same level of consideration. Whilst no counter-objections were received in relation to these objections, this is also not determining. We do not support the inclusion of these lands within the SDL.

- 2.2.7 Objections 312 and 5522 requested the inclusion of land **between Nos. 101-107 Ballybogy Road** for housing and mixed use purposes. Located on the north-eastern side of the Ballybogy Road, it would not be appropriate for the development limit to breach the road at this location given that the majority of the settlement's development is located on the other side of the carriageway. The narrow nature of the site, level of mature vegetation which should be retained and the location of the Burn Gushet River along a section of its eastern boundary would, at any rate, constrain the development of this site. Little substantive evidence was presented in relation to the need for mixed land uses at this location. Whether or not a proposal for residential development here would comply with PPS 21: Sustainable Development in the Countryside is a matter to be assessed through the Development Management process. No persuasive evidence was presented to support the claims that there is an affordability issue or need for social housing here; NIHE did not identify any such need. The other arguments about the benefits of including this land and claims in relation to the previous residential use of the land and the presence of the derelict shed located on site are not determining factors in this instance. As all objections are given the same weight, it is of little consequence that these were the only Option C objections. The fact that there were no counter-objections in relation to these objections is also not of determining weight.
- 2.2.8 Objection 330 sought the inclusion of **No.108 Ballybogy Road** and its associated land for residential purposes. There is no need for the proposed development limit to be extended for residential purposes given the extent of the housing provision within Ballybogy.
- 2.2.9 Objection 330 requested the inclusion of land **including and west of No.3 Heagles Road** for housing purposes. There is no need for the proposed development limit to be extended to accommodate additional housing land given the extent of the housing provision within Ballybogy.
- 2.2.10 Objections 332 and 4831 requested the inclusion and zoning for housing of land **north and north-east of No.99 Ballybogy Road, south-east of the**

**junction of Ballybogy and Benvarin Roads.** Given the location of this land at a busy road junction and its open nature, development here would appear visually prominent. As the majority of the settlement's development is located on the opposite side of Ballybogy Road, housing here would appear divorced from the village, resulting in urban sprawl in an easterly direction. To locate development on this site would unacceptably interrupt views and the setting of the old corn/ flax mill and the associated mill pond and race. The Burn Gushet River, which runs through this land, also allows ecological connectivity between the areas of woodland located within this area; development here could interfere with this process.

- 2.2.11 Objection 4313 requested that land **west of Meadowbrook housing development, Ballindreen Road** be included within the proposed development limit. To include this land would result in the elongating of the settlement's form in a westerly direction and create urban sprawl.
- 2.2.12 Objection 4986 sought the inclusion and zoning for housing of land **west of Housing Zoning BBH 03, Ballybogy Road.** Given the extent of the housing over-provision within the settlement, there is no need for additional residential land to be included within the proposed development limit.

#### **LOCAL LANDSCAPE POLICY AREA**

- 2.2.13 No substantive evidence was presented by objection 330 to support their claim that Designation BBL 01 Burn Gushet LLPA does not accurately reflect the area to be covered by such a designation. We therefore do not support their request that this designation be re-assessed. Objections 332 and 4831 requested that land **north and north-east of No.99 Ballybogy Road**, south-east of the junction of Ballybogy and Benvarin Roads be excluded from the designation. Despite arguments why the area should be excluded, Paragraph 6.1 in the Department's statement on the Option C objections however provides further clarification on the features of the proposed Designation BBL 01. The Departmental evidence states that the LLPA includes attractive views of the old flax mill and areas of local nature conservation interest including the river corridor and associated vegetation; this land significantly contributes to these features. For clarification purposes, therefore, we suggest that the Department supplement Paragraph 4.1 (p.24) of dNAP (Volume 2, Part 4: Ballymoney Borough; Ballybogy) with the information contained within Paragraph 6.1 of the Departmental Option C statement. Given the valid contribution that the land makes to the LLPA, we therefore do not support the objections.
- 2.2.14 Objection 5522 argued that land located **between Nos 101-107 Ballybogy Road** did not warrant inclusion within the proposed Designation BBL 01 due to a number of factors. They also suggested that the wording of the text in relation to Designation BBL 01 should say that the site could accommodate sensitive development, which would require a 10m buffer area along the Burn Gushet, require a tree survey and flood risk assessment. The appropriateness of recommending this land for development was assessed in the previous section of this report. The inclusion of land within a LLPA does not however prevent its inclusion within a development limit or prevent its future development per se, provided that it is demonstrated that a proposal would not adversely impact on the environmental quality, integrity or character of the

area. Whilst it is accepted that the derelict barn on site is not a valued feature of the LLPA, the river banks of the Burn Gushet River located along part of the eastern site boundary and their associated vegetation are and they are an area of local nature conservation interest. The presence of sewers and its roadside location do not lessen the contribution of this land to the LLPA. As we consider that this area makes a valued contribution to the proposed designation, we do not support the objection.

### **Recommendation**

#### **2.2.15 We recommend that:**

- **The Department supplement Paragraph 4.1 (p.24) of dNAP (Volume 2, Part 4: Ballymoney Borough; Ballybogy) with the information contained within Paragraph 6.1 of the Departmental Option C statement.**

### **OPEN SPACE DESIGNATION**

2.2.16 Objection 336 objected to an area labelled as '**Wheatland Park**' on Map No. 2/02-Ballybogy (dNAP, Map Booklet) being designated as a major area of open space due to the argument that it has not been used as public open space but rather is associated with the commercial complex at **No.102 Ballybogy Road**. Given that it was identified by error and lacks amenity value, the Department recommended that this area is not shown as 'Open Space'. We concur with this suggestion and recommend that it be shown as whiteland.

### **Recommendation**

#### **2.2.17 We recommend that:**

- **The Wheatfield Park area of 'major area of existing open space' be identified as whiteland.**

## 2.3 BALNAMORE

### Provision for Housing and the Settlement Development Limit

- 2.3.1 Balnamore was designated as a village within the North East Area Plan; the draft Northern Area Plan (dNAP) proposes to retain this designation. Designation BN01 proposes a settlement development limit (SDL) for Balnamore and is identified on Map 2/03.
- 2.3.2 Taking account of the 2008 HGI revision for Ballymoney District the draft plan allocates Balnamore 97 housing units. Between January 1999 and August 2010 132 housing units were completed and it is estimated that approximately 253 housing units could be accommodated within the proposed SDL. This is a surplus of 156 housing units (160.8%) above the plan allocation.

### Social Housing

- 2.3.3 The Department's Housing Update Paper (March 2011) states that there is a need for 7 social housing need within Balnamore over the next 7 years (2010-2017). As land has not been identified within the development limit, the Department have indicated within their March 2011 paper that a potential site/s in appropriate location/s may be considered in the context of Policy CTY 5 of PPS 21. We therefore conclude that there is no need for additional land to be included within the SDL to meet social housing needs.

### Sites Outside the Settlement Development Limit

- 2.3.4 A number of objections were received seeking the inclusion of parcels of land for housing or as whiteland within the proposed settlement development limit. Objection 330 sought the inclusion and zoning for housing of land **north of No. 38 Taughey Road**. Whilst this land is enclosed by mature vegetation, to develop it would result in the unacceptable elongating of the settlement's form in a northerly direction. It would therefore not contribute to achieving a compact urban form.
- 2.3.5 Objection 330 sought the inclusion of land **north of No.45 and west of Nos. 45-51 Taughey Road**; they requested that the land be zoned for housing purposes. The lack of screening along the northern objection site boundary results in this large, flat area being visually prominent when approaching Balnamore from a northerly direction. To locate development here would unsatisfactorily elongate the settlement, expanding it further in a northerly direction. We do not support this objection.
- 2.3.6 Objections 4862 and 5013 requested the inclusion and zoning for housing of land to the north of **Balnamore House**. Objection 5013 also sought the inclusion within the development limit of Balnamore House and its associated land. The site is located on the eastern edge of Balnamore. The argument that the site could be utilised in order to provide social housing was not supported with substantive detailed information. Concerns in relation to the inadequacy of the application of PPS 21 in providing social housing are matters for the objector to address directly within the Department and are beyond the remit of the plan. In relation to the enabling development argument, such a

case is best being assessed through the development management process when the full merits of a detailed proposal could be investigated. The enabling development argument does not justify or necessitate the site being included within the proposed development limit and/or zoned for housing use. That the objector has been investigating a use for Balnamore House for a number of years and that the house has been vacant for a considerable period of time are arguments that could be assessed when a detailed development proposal is being pursued through the development management process. Whilst the site and the trees may already be protected by existing planning policies and by legislation, the inclusion of the site within the development limit would introduce a presumption in favour of development. Despite the argument that Balnamore House is not an asset within LLPA Designation BHL 01 Balnamore Mill/O'Harabrook LLPA, the plan clearly states that Balnamore House is a feature that contributes to the environmental quality, integrity and character of the area. In relation to the claim that the inclusion of land within a LLPA designation should not sterilise it from development has to be assessed on a case by case basis once a detailed proposal is presented in order to ensure that a proposal does not adversely affect the features of the LLPA, which in this instance would be Balnamore House. Designation BHL 01 does however rightly state that most of this LLPA is unsuitable for development. In relation to the argument that the objector could renew the planning permission to demolish existing outbuildings, refurbish and construct an extension to Balnamore House to provide a hotel (D/2001/0116/F), this is a matter for them to pursue through the development management process if they so wish. Given that this planning permission has expired and the fact that the proposed housing site is located outside the area where planning permission was originally granted, this suggestion does not justify the inclusion of the proposed site within the proposed development limit or any of its zoning for housing use. The claim in relation to the inconsistent application of Policy BH 11 in PPS 6, which deals with the impact of a specific development proposal on the setting of a listed building, is also a matter for the objector to pursue directly with the Department or to argue during the processing of a specific proposal. Arguments in relation to the impact of Millfield housing development and the granting of the previous planning permission (D/2001/0116/F) do not justify the inclusion of any of this unneeded land within the proposed limit or zoning for housing purposes. There should be no change to the Plan as a result of these objections.

- 2.3.7 Objection 4961 requested the inclusion and zoning for residential purposes of land **adjacent and west of Beechwood Drive, Balnamore Road**. This extensive, flat land lacks a suitable degree of enclosure and, as a result, development here would appear prominent when approaching Balnamore from a westerly direction. To include this land would elongate the settlement in a westerly direction, thus resulting in urban sprawl.
- 2.3.8 Objection 4986 requested that land **between Nos. 73 and 87 Balnamore Road** be included in the development limit and zoned for housing. This extensive area is quite elevated and therefore development here would be visually prominent at this western entrance/exit to the settlement. Residential development located here would appear divorced from the settlement and would result in urban sprawl.

- 2.3.9 Objection 4986 sought the inclusion and zoning for residential purposes of land **west of Balnamore House, Balnamore Road**. This land is already developed as part of the Millfields housing development and therefore there is no need to zone it for housing purposes.

### **HOUSING ZONINGS**

- 2.3.10 Objection 330 objected to the various housing zonings within Balnamore. Given that BNH 01 and BNH 02 are developed and that housing zoning BNH 03 has planning permission (D/2005/0150/O), there should be no change to the Plan as a result of these objections.

### **INDUSTRIAL DESIGNATION**

- 2.3.11 A number of objections were received in relation to Industrial Designation BNI 01 by objections 330, 4667, 4850 and 5757. No substantive evidence was presented by objection 330 to support their claim that this designation does not accurately reflect the area required to be covered by such a designation. Since the publication of dNAP, planning permission was granted on 30<sup>th</sup> November 2009 (D/2006/0053/O) for the mixed used regeneration of Balnamore Mill complex. The approved scheme comprised of residential, business, light industrial and community facilities as well as associated development works. In addition to this approval, on 1<sup>st</sup> September 2011 clarification to Policy PED 7 'The retention of zoned land and economic development uses' was published by the Department. This emphasises the importance of retaining both zoned and unzoned land last used for economic purposes in order to facilitate employment opportunities in settlements. Paragraph 5.32 of the amplification text to Policy PED 7 does however acknowledge that there may be a degree of flexibility engaged in specific circumstances which may permit the redevelopment of an existing industrial site with a mixed use scheme, as a specific regeneration initiative to meet the needs of a particular locality whilst providing a significant element of employment or community uses. Therefore, given the protection that is provided to the industrial site under regional planning policy and the fact that planning permission has been granted for the redevelopment of the site, which includes light industrial and business uses, we are not persuaded that any change should be made to Industrial Designation BNI 01.

### **OPEN SPACE ZONING**

- 2.3.12 Objection 4850 stated that Open Space Zoning BNO 01 and the existing open space provision within Balnamore was excessive. They requested the reduction of Open Space Zoning BNO 01, allowing housing development in lieu. They suggested that housing zoning BNH 03 be zoned for open space purposes. As previously stated, housing zoning BNH 03 has planning approval for residential purposes (D/2005/0150/O) and therefore to consider re-zoning it as open space does not warrant further assessment. As stated within Paragraph 4.2 of dNAP (p.27, Volume 2, Part 4: Ballymoney Borough; Balnamore), the area of the proposed open space zoning BNO 01 is a former mill pond which provides an attractive amenity within the settlement. Given that Balnamore is said to just have a 0.26ha surplus of existing open space (p.22, dNAP, Technical Supplement 6: Open Space, Sport and Outdoor Recreation),

we do not accept the argument that the settlement's open space provision is excessive. This vegetated area is a key feature of Designation BNL 01 Balnamore Mill/O'Harabrook LLPA and should remain free from development as sought in Paragraph 4.2 of dNAP (p.27, Volume 2, Part 4: Ballymoney Borough; Balnamore). No substantive evidence was presented that Open Space Zoning BNO 01 will adversely impact on the settlement's future development. As established earlier in this report, there is also no strategic need for additional housing land to be zoned within Balnamore. There should be no change to the Plan as a result of this objection.

### **LLPA DESIGNATION**

- 2.3.13 Objection 330 objected to the inclusion of proposed LLPA designation BNL 01 within Balnamore's proposed settlement limit considering it to contravene the nature of a settlement limit. However, given that LLPAs do not prevent development per se, but rather seek to ensure that proposed development respects the area's environmental quality and integrity, we do not agree that its location within the proposed development limit is contradictory. The other objections to the proposed LLPA designation BNL 01 by objections 330 and 5013 were unsubstantiated.

## 2.4 CLOGHMILLS

### Provision for Housing and the Settlement Development Limit

- 2.4.1 Cloghmills was designated as a village within the NEAP and NAP proposes to retain this designation. Designation CS01 proposes a settlement development limit (SDL) for Cloghmills and is identified on Map 2/04.
- 2.4.2 Taking account of the 2008 HGI revision for Ballymoney District the draft plan allocates Cloghmills 209 housing units. Between January 1999 and August 2010 129 housing units were completed and it is estimated that approximately 194 housing units could be accommodated within the proposed SDL. This is a deficit of 15 housing units (-7.2%) below the plan allocation.

### Social Housing

- 2.4.3 The Department's Housing Update Paper (March 2011) states that there is a need for 9 social housing need within Cloghmills over the next 7 years (2010-2017). As land has not been identified within the development limit, the Department have indicated within their March 2011 paper that a potential site/s in appropriate location/s may be considered in the context of Policy CTY 5 of PPS 21. We therefore conclude that there is no need for additional land to be included within the SDL to meet social housing needs.

### Sites Outside the Settlement Development Limit

- 2.4.4 A number of objections were received requesting that various parcels of land be included within the proposed settlement development limit. Objection 329 sought the inclusion of lands **north-east of Nos. 48-60 Main Street**. This extensive agricultural field appears divorced from the settlement and has a very rural character. The objector stated that the land was located south of a built up residential area and that it would appear as a natural progression of development to the east of the village. The land however is separated from the development to the north-west by the Rosedermot Road. The other development to the south-west is also screened by the mature vegetation on the objection site's south-western boundary. To include this area would result in urban sprawl, with the settlement expanding further in a south-easterly direction.
- 2.4.5 Objections 330 and 4935 sought the inclusion of lands **south and west of Nos. 15-17 Ballycregagh Road**. Objection 4935 also requested the inclusion of land **north-east of No.11 Drumbare Road**. Irrespective of some of this land being previously included within NEAP's development limit for Cloghmills and having planning permission for a detached dwelling, the site lacks adequate enclosure along its western and eastern boundaries. Development here would appear prominent in the landscape especially when approaching Cloghmills from a southerly direction. As development on this side of Ballycregagh Road is dispersed, and given the significance of the length of the gap between No.17 Ballycregagh Road and the development on Drumbare Road, we are not persuaded by objection 4935's arguments that the inclusion of this land would amount to infilling, squaring off or to the consolidation of Cloghmills' urban form. By its very nature, the land zoned for open space (CSO 01) will not

- adequately enclose the site especially as Paragraph 4.2 within dNAP Volume 2 (p.31) states that this area is to meet the need for a football pitch in the village. The suggestion of buffer planting along the undefined western boundary would take a significant amount of time to mature and would not overcome the objections to the inclusion of these lands. We do not support the inclusion of this land within the SDL.
- 2.4.6 Objections 330, 5183 and 5719 requested the inclusion of land **west of Nos. 13-35 Main Street**. Objection 330 also sought the inclusion of land **north-east of Cloghmills' Sewerage Treatment Works (WWTW)**. Whilst views of this area are limited, there is no need for any of this extensive area to be included for residential housing purposes given the minimal notional housing shortfall that exists within Cloghmills. The area's proximity to Cloghmills' WWTW and the presence of an unscheduled archaeological site and monument may also hinder the development of this site.
- 2.4.7 Objection 4930 requested the inclusion of land **south and south-west of Industrial Designation CSI 01, Ballycregagh Road** for industrial purposes. Given the extension of the former Reid Transport's yard (D/2005/0499/F) which appears to have been implemented, we recommend that this area now be included within the proposed settlement limit.
- 2.4.8 Objection 4935 requested the inclusion and zoning for industrial purposes of land **including, west and south of No.29 Drumbare Road**. Despite the existing industrial use of the site and the economic benefits that this employer gives to Cloghmills and the surrounding area, this site is removed from the settlement's core. To include this extensive area would result in an unacceptable elongation of Cloghmills in a south-west direction, resulting in urban sprawl. Planning Policy Statement 4: Planning and Economic Development (Nov.2010) facilitates an appropriate expansion of an established economic development use in the countryside under Policy PED 3 without the site being located within Cloghmills' settlement limit. The benefits of the site in terms of accessibility, availability of services and substantial buildings are not therefore determining factors in this case. The arguments that there is an insufficient supply of industrial land available within Cloghmills and that the RDS advocates a generous supply of industrial land are also not persuasive given the status of Cloghmills as a village and the RDS's emphasis on promoting industrial uses within the region's cities and hubs. There should be no change to the Plan as a result of this objection.
- 2.4.9 Objection 4974 sought the inclusion of land **south of Churchill Avenue, Ballycregagh Road**. To include this area would unacceptably elongate the settlement's form in a southerly direction, resulting in urban sprawl. Given the sloping nature of the land, we do not accept that the inclusion of this land would have a limited visual impact but rather that development here would appear quite prominent in the landscape.
- 2.4.10 Objections 4880 and 5527 requested the inclusion of land **including and north-east of No.21 Drumadoon Road**. Objection 4880 also sought the inclusion of land **opposite and south-west of No.21 Drumadoon Road**. Objection 5527 also requested that land located **between Nos. 21 and 43 Drumadoon Road, No.43 Drumadoon Road and lands north-east of No.43**

- Drumadoon Road up to and opposite No.55 Culcrum Road** be included. Irrespective of the fact that these lands are in proximity to the proposed development limit, to include any of this substantial area would result in an elongation of the settlement's urban form in a north-easterly direction, creating urban sprawl. To include these lands would result in development appearing quite prominent in the landscape due to their lack of screening and rising topography. We do not support the inclusion of any of these lands within the SDL.
- 2.4.11 Objection 5009, 5183 and 5719 requested the inclusion of land **south-west of Nos. 7-11 Main Street and south-east of Nos. 9-12 Princess Gardens, Main Street**. Given the facts that: these lands nestle into the settlement form; their inclusion would have very limited visual impact; access can be provided via Springhill Manor; that they were previously included within NEAP's limit; are modest in size; have no obvious development constraints; their inclusion is supported by the Department, we therefore recommend that they should be included within the proposed development limit and zoned for housing purposes in order to meet the notional housing shortfall within Cloghmills.
- 2.4.12 Objection 5009 requested that land **south-east of housing zoning CSH 07** (Springhill Manor) be zoned for commercial purposes or be left as whiteland. Irrespective of the presence of the garage/petrol station along Main Street to the east of the site, it is not appropriate to zone land at this location for commercial purposes given the status of the settlement; such development would be best concentrated in the Borough's local hub, Ballymoney town. Given that there is only a small notional housing shortfall within the settlement, there is no strategic housing need to include this land as whiteland within the development limit.
- 2.4.13 Objection 5009 requested the inclusion of lands **south-west of housing zoning CSH 07 Drumadoon Road and south-west of Nos. 16-16b Drumadoon Road (Housing Zoning CSH 02)**. These lands nestle into the urban form of Cloghmills and their inclusion within proposed development limit would have a limited visual impact. However, given the small deficit of housing land that was identified by the Department for the village and the suitability of the lands adjacent to Princess Gardens to meet that deficit, we are not persuaded of the need to include the objection lands within the SDL.
- 2.4.14 Objection 5009 sought the inclusion and zoning for housing of land **north and north-east of No.205 Ballyveely Road**. To include this attractive land would result in a substantial expansion of the settlement, elongating it in a northerly direction, thus resulting in urban sprawl into the surrounding countryside. There may also be access difficulties given the narrow nature of the road at this location. We do not support the inclusion of this land within the SDL.

### **Recommendations**

**2.4.15 We recommend that:**

- **The land south-west of Nos. 7-11 Main Street and south-east of Nos. 9-12 Princess Gardens (area of Objection 5719 drawing no.A0529.02 and**

**part of objections 5009 and 5183) be included within the proposed settlement development limit.**

- **Include the area of Objection 4930 (D/2005/0499/F) within the proposed settlement development limit.**

## **HOUSING ZONINGS**

- 2.4.16 Objection 330 objected to all the proposed housing zonings within Cloghmills. Given that the proposed settlement development limit is considered to be adequate when the land adjacent to Princess Gardens, Main Street (objections 5009, 5183 and 5719) is included, we do not agree that the housing zonings are inadequate in order to meet housing demand in Cloghmills. Access issues in relation to Housing Zoning CSH 06 were unsubstantiated and Key Site Requirement (KSR) No.2 acknowledges that additional lands may be required to provide an access to Drumadoon Road, on to which KSR No.3 requests that the dwellings be orientated towards as opposed to Ballycregagh Road. Given that Housing Zoning CSH 07 is said by the Department to have been developed, concerns in relation to its access arrangements are also unsupported. There should be no change to the Plan as a result of these objections.

## **INDUSTRIAL DESIGNATION**

- 2.4.17 Objection 330 raised concerns in relation to Industrial Designation CSI 01 being inadequate, restricted by the designation of an AAP and LLPA and argued that it reduces the potential for future investment and the creation of new employment opportunities. This is an existing industrial site and the designation of further industrial lands has been previously discussed within the report.

## **OPEN SPACE ZONING**

- 2.4.18 Objection 330 stated that Open Space Zoning CSO 01 should be located within the proposed development limit however no apparent benefit or substantive justification was provided by the objector. Objections 4930 and 4935 objected to the inclusion of various areas of land within Open Space Zoning CSO 01 however we are not persuaded by the various arguments as to why the zoning should be removed from their land or relocated to elsewhere in the village. There should be no change to the Plan as a result of these objections.

## **AREA OF ARCHAEOLOGICAL POTENTIAL**

- 2.4.19 Objection 330 objected to the Cloghmills Area of Archaeological Potential (AAP) underlying Housing Zoning CSH 05 as they considered that it could restrict the potential yield from the site. The AAP is shown for information purposes to highlight to potential developers that the area may contain archaeological remains and therefore they are advised to liaise with the Department prior to submitting a proposal within this area. The identification of the area therefore does not necessarily mean that the potential yield from the proposed housing zoning will be adversely affected.

**LOCAL LANDSCAPE POLICY AREA**

- 2.4.20 Objection 330 stated numerous concerns in relation to the overlap between the proposed development limit and Designation CSL 01 Cloghmills Water LLPA. This objection was however unsupported by substantive evidence and LLPAs do not prevent development per se but rather seek to ensure that any development respects the environmental quality, character and integrity of the area. Objection 4930 objected to the inclusion of a small area of an existing factory yard within the LLPA. They stated that the landscape setting of the factory could be improved by environmental improvements including bank stabilization and new planting. The inclusion of this area within Designation CSL 01 may not prevent such improvements and the objection to the inclusion of the land was unsubstantiated. No changes are suggested to the Plan as a result of these objections.

## 2.5 DERVOCK

### Provision for Housing and the Settlement Development Limit

- 2.5.1 Dervock was designated as a village within the North East Area Plan (NEAP) and the draft Northern Area Plan (dNAP) also proposes to retain this designation. Designation DV01 proposes a Settlement Development Limit (SDL) for Dervock and this is identified on Map No. 2/05.
- 2.5.2 Taking account of the 2008 HGI revision for Ballymoney District the draft plan makes provision for 113 housing units in Dervock and between January 1999 and August 2010 92 units were completed. The Housing Update Paper (March 2011) estimated that approximately 325 housing units could be accommodated within the settlement limit over the plan period; this would amount to a surplus of approximately 212 units (187.6%) above the plan allocation.

### Social Housing

- 2.5.3 The Department's Housing Update Paper (March 2011) states that there is no social housing need within Dervock over the next 7 years (2010-2017).

### Sites Outside the Settlement Development Limit

- 2.5.4 A number of objections were received requesting that various parcels of land be included within the proposed settlement development limit. Objection 330 requested that lands to the **east of Derrykeighan Parish Church and north of No. 113 Toberdoney Road** be included within the proposed development limit. The inclusion of this land would serve to elongate the settlement in a north-easterly direction along Toberdoney Road and would therefore not help to consolidate the settlement's form.
- 2.5.5 Objections 330 and 5186 sought the inclusion of **No. 228 Castlecat Road** and its surrounding land and the **telephone exchange at Castlecat Road**. There is no need for additional housing land to be included within the proposed development limit given the potential over-provision of land for residential purposes. Given the lands proximity to the listed Derrykeighan Parish Church, it is considered that any more extensive development to what is already here could impact on its setting.
- 2.5.6 Objections 330 and 5186 sought the inclusion of land to the **north of No. 112 Toberdoney Road**. This vegetated and prominent area provides part of the attractive entrance/exit to Dervock. To include this area within the proposed development limit would not only result in the loss of this vegetation but also serve to unacceptably elongate the settlement form along Toberdoney Road.
- 2.5.7 Objections 330 and 5186 sought the inclusion of lands **south of No. 126 Toberdoney Road**. Objection 330 suggested that it was physically suitable for residential purposes. This attractive vegetative area in the centre of the settlement is proposed as zoned open space and also is located within Designation DVL01 Dervock River LLPA. The inclusion of this proposed open space zoning within the proposed development is considered below. Part of this site has planning permission (D/2004/0326/F for 8 units) which the

- Department suggest should be included within the limit; we concur with this position. In terms of the remaining area, given the lack of need for additional residential land within Dervock, we are not persuaded that this area should be included for housing purposes. Given the attractiveness of this area, we would also be concerned that development here would result in the loss of valuable vegetation thus adversely impacting on the integrity of the proposed LLPA designation. We therefore consider that this land would be best kept as zoned open space.
- 2.5.8 Objections 330 and 5186 sought the inclusion of lands **south and south-west of Travers Place, Carncullagh Road** with frontage onto Station Road. Objection 5303 also requested the inclusion of an area within this, **west of Station Cottages** however no substantive evidence was provided as to why these should be zoned for residential use. Planning permission has however been granted on this site (D/2005/0297/F) for 92 dwellings and as a result, we concur with the Department's recommendation that the area of the approval be included within the proposed development limit. The inclusion of the area south of Travers Place would overcome the objections.
- 2.5.9 Objections 330, 4358 and 5186 sought the inclusion of lands **south of No. 149 Knock Road**. Objection 4358 also requested the inclusion of lands to the south and east of this area **between Nos. 149-151 Knock Road and Dervock River**. A small area of objection 4358, **south-east of No.151 Knock Road**, has planning approval under D/2008/0270/F. Whilst the Department stated that it has no objection to the inclusion of the approved area within the development limit, this area already appears to be included within the proposed limit. In terms of the remaining site area, the inclusion of this land would unacceptably spread development in Dervock in a southerly direction resulting in urban sprawl especially as there is only built development to the north of this land. Development here would also impact on the views and setting of the Dervock River corridor which is a feature of Designation DVL01 Dervock River LLPA.
- 2.5.10 Objections 337 and 5118 sought the inclusion of land **north of the junction of Stroan and Station Roads** to the south of Station Cottages. There is no need for additional housing land to be included with their proposed development limit given the potential extent of housing over provision within Dervock. Development here would also be poorly enclosed by mature vegetation.
- 2.5.11 Objection 4445 requested the inclusion of three areas: land **including and surrounding Moorefield estate, north of McArthur Avenue**; to the **north-east of the telephone exchange, Castlecat Road**; **south of Straham View and west of The Bramble, Knock Road**. Rather than their inclusion enhancing the shape and appearance of the village as claimed by the objection, their location on the periphery of the settlement would mean that development here would result in urban sprawl and fail to promote a compact settlement form.
- 2.5.12 Objection 4986 sought the inclusion of **land west and north of No. 136 Knock Road and south and south-east of No. 134 Knock Road**. The objector requested that this area be zoned for housing use. To include this area would elongate the settlement's form along Knock Road, resulting in urban sprawl.

- 2.5.13 Objection 5142 requested the inclusion and zoning for housing of lands including **Castle Close and Derrykeighan Parish Church on Castlecat Road, north of Derrykeighan Parish Church and Nos. 112 and 113 Toberdoney Road and east of Nos. 112 to 126 Toberdoney Road and north-west of No. 18 Carncullagh Road**. The objector argued that these lands were available and viable for housing use. Part of these extensive lands are already developed (Castle Close housing development and Derrykeighan Parish Church). Located within the proposed Designation DVL01 Dervock River LLPA, this vegetated area is crucial as part of the village and Dervock River corridor setting when approaching/exiting the settlement via the Toberdoney Road. The lands to the west of Toberdoney Road are part of the setting of the listed Derrykeighan Parish Church, and it is considered that development here would therefore be inappropriate. The inclusion of these lands would result in the settlement sprawling in a north-easterly direction which would fail to consolidate its urban form. A large area of land to the east of Toberdoney Road is also located within the flood plain which may impact on the developability of these lands. We do not support the inclusion of these lands within the SDL.
- 2.5.14 Objections 5186 and 5527 sought the inclusion of lands **north of housing zoning DVH01**. The area adjacent and directly north of housing zoning DVH 01 has planning permission (D/2005/0477/RM) for 41 dwelling units and we agree that this area should be included within the proposed development limit. In relation to the remaining site area, to include these lands would result in the sprawling of the settlement in a northerly direction which would be unacceptable in terms of urban form.
- 2.5.15 Objection 5186 sought the inclusion of lands **north of Nos. 154-172 Knock Road**. There is no need for additional land to be included within the proposed development limit for residential purposes given the extent of the potential housing over-provision within Dervock. To include this land would serve to exacerbate this over-provision and therefore the objection is unsupported.
- 2.5.16 Objection 5303 sought the inclusion of lands **between the Dervock River and Carncullagh Road including Nos. 9a-15 Carncullagh Road and lands to the west of Travers Place, Carncullagh Road**. This site includes the listed North Irish Horse Inn and a number of period properties which are considered to be of local architectural and historic merit. This area is included within Designation DVL01 Dervock River LLPA and its vegetated riverside location is thought to contribute to the setting to the village and the Dervock River Corridor. A substantial part of this site is also indicated to be within the flood plain. We do not support the inclusion of this land within the SDL.
- 2.5.17 Objection 5486 requested the inclusion and zoning for housing purposes of lands **opposite Nos. 130-142 Knock Road, to the south, west and north of No. 139 Knock Road**. To include such an expansive area would result in the unacceptable sprawling of the settlement in a westerly direction along Knock Road. The majority of the area is also located within Designation DVL02 Dervock River East LLPA and contributes to the village's setting. The exclusion of this land from the SDL is endorsed.

2.5.18 Objection 5527 sought the inclusion and zoning for housing of **No. 229 Castlecat Road and its land to the north, south and west**. To include these extensive lands would serve to elongate the settlement's form, with development here appearing divorced from the main urban form of Dervock.

### **Recommendation**

2.5.19 **We recommend that:**

- **The area of D/2004/0326/F (objections 330 and 5186) located south of No.126 Toberdoney Road be included within the proposed settlement development limit.**
- **The area of D/2005/0297/F (objections 330 and 5186) south and south-west of Travers Place, Carncullagh Road with frontage onto Station Road) be included within the proposed settlement development limit.**
- **The area of D/2005/0477/RM (objection 5186 and 5527) north of housing zoning DVH 01 be included within the proposed settlement development limit.**

### **HOUSING ZONINGS**

2.5.20 Objection 330 objected to the various proposed housing zonings stating that they were inadequate to meet demand. Given the level of potential overprovision of housing, however, these objections are unsupported. Objection 5186 also objected to the housing zonings (with the exception of DVH01) however these were unsubstantiated. Objection 330's concerns in relation to the access to housing zonings DVH06 and DVH09 and the impact that the retention of trees on DVH09 will have on its potential housing yield are unsupported given that housing zoning DVH06 is said by the Department to be under construction and DVH09 has extant planning permission. The concerns in relation to the impact that the Area of Archaeological Potential (AAP) and the retention of the trees on site would have on the yield from housing zoning DVH07 are also unsupported given the informative nature of the AAP designation; the location of the trees on the perimeter of the site should not significantly restrict the site's yield.

2.5.21 Objection was also raised to the Area of Archaeological Potential underlying housing zonings DVH08 and DVH10. As stated within Paragraph 5.1 (page 36, dNAP, Volume 2, Part 4: Ballymoney Borough; Dervock), the Area of Archaeological Potential, however, has been identified in order to notify potential developers that the area may contain archaeological remains and that they are strongly advised to liaise with the Department prior to submitting any development proposals in this area. No substantive evidence was presented to demonstrate how this could impact on their potential housing yield. Objection 330 also objected to restrictions on housing zoning DVH 10 due to the presence of the floodplain within the eastern part of the zoning DVH10 and stated that this would restrict the potential yield from the site. Given the restrictive size of the site (0.13ha) yield is going to be limited. Key site requirements (KSR) No. 2 requests that development be restricted to the Toberdoney Road frontage in order to preserve the rural character of the

Dervock river corridor and to reflect the roadside development pattern; this would, at any rate, prevent development occurring to the east of the site. The objection is, therefore, unsupported. Objection 330's concern that insufficient land has been zoned as part of housing zoning DVH08 in order to provide access from Carncullagh Road is acknowledged by Key Site Requirement No. 2. The acquisition of the land to access the site is a matter for the potential developer and highlighting the extent of the required lands will not aid this process.

### **OPEN SPACE ZONING**

- 2.5.22 Objection 5186's objection to open space zoning DVO01 was unsubstantiated and is therefore unsupported. Objection 330 objected to the positioning of open space zoning DVO01 outside the proposed development limit and sought its inclusion. Whilst no substantive evidence was presented, given the settlement's form at this location, with built development substantially enclosing the site, it appears illogical to exclude this area from the proposed development limit. Its use would be protected under regional planning policy contained within Planning Policy Statement 8: Open Space, Sport and Outdoor recreation. We, therefore, recommend that Open Space zoning DVO01 be included within the proposed settlement development limit.

### **Recommendation**

- 2.5.23 **We recommend that:**

- **Open Space zoning DVO01 be included within the proposed settlement development limit.**

### **AREA OF ARCHAEOLOGICAL POTENTIAL**

- 2.5.24 Objection 330 claimed that the Area of Archaeological Potential does not accurately reflect the area to be covered by such a designation and Objection 5303 requested that lands between Dervock River and Carncullagh Road be excluded from the AAP. This designation is shown for information purposes only and highlights for potential developers the likelihood of archaeological remains being present. No change to the Plan is recommended as a result of these objections.

### **LOCAL LANDSCAPE POLICY AREAS**

- 2.5.25 A number of objections were received in relation to the proposed LLPA designations. Objection 330 objected to what they referred to as the blanket designations of DVL01 Dervock River LLPA and DVL02 Dervock River East LLPA however no substantive evidence was presented to support their claims. Rather than prevent development per se, LLPAs seek to ensure that the environmental quality, integrity and character of the areas are protected. Objection 330 queried the reasoning for including the sewerage works within designation DVL02 Dervock River East LLPA. Despite the absence of substantive evidence, given the sewerage work's riverside location, it appears logical that it be included within this LLPA which seeks to protect the area between the river and Knock Road in order to protect views of the setting of the

river corridor and of the settlement. Objection 330 also stated that the location of housing zoning DVH08 and DVH10 within designation DVL01 Dervock River LLPA was confusing and unacceptable as they consider that LLPAs restrict development and the potential yields from the sites. As stated earlier, the location of these lands within the LLPA does not restrict development however seeks to ensure the environment quality, integrity or character of this area are protected. We are therefore not persuaded by the arguments presented.

- 2.5.26 Objections 337, 5186, 5299, 5303 and 5486 objections to the LLPAs were unsubstantiated and are therefore unsupported. Objection 5142 argued that Planning Strategy for Rural Northern Ireland (PSRNI) and existing and emerging Planning Policy Statements provide sufficient protection and could control development on their land ensuring that it would not adversely affect its rural character. They requested that the lands at **Derrykeighan Parish Church, north of Derrykeighan Parish Church and Nos. 112 and 113 Toberdoney Road and east of Nos. 112 to 116 Toberdoney and north-west of No. 18 Carncullagh Road** be removed from DVL01 Dervock River LLPA. No substantive evidence was presented to demonstrate why these lands do not warrant designation. The relevant policy guidance is contained not only under Designation DVL01, but also in Policy ENV2: Local Landscape Policy Areas (LLPAs) within Volume 1 of the draft Northern Area Plan and Paragraphs 2.23 and 2.24 (p.12) of PPS 6: Planning, Archaeology and the Built Heritage (1999). There should be no change to the Plan as a result of these objections.

## 2.6 DUNLOY

### Provision for Housing and the Settlement Development Limit

- 2.6.1 Dunloy was designated as a village by the NEAP; dNAP proposes to retain this designation. Designation DL01 proposes a Settlement Development Limit (SDL) for Dervock and this is identified on Map No. 2/06.
- 2.6.2 Taking account of the 2008 HGI revision for Ballymoney District the draft plan makes provision for 198 housing units in Dunloy and between January 1999 and August 2010 109 units were completed. The Housing Update Paper (March 2011) estimated that approximately 301 housing units could be accommodated within the settlement limit over the plan period; this would amount to a surplus of approximately 103 units (52%) above the plan allocation.
- 2.6.3 Due to the generous development limit provided for Dunloy by NEAP, dNAP seeks to contract this in order to consolidate the settlement's form and to reflect its function. Two housing developments have however been approved outside the proposed settlement development limit (D/2005/0859/RM at No.30 Bellaghy Road and D/2003/0654/F at No.60 Bridge Road) and the Department stated that they have no objection to their inclusion within the proposed limit. We consider this to be a logical approach and recommend accordingly.

### Social Housing

- 2.6.4 The Department's Housing Update Paper (March 2011) states that there is a need for 9 social housing units within Dunloy over the next 7 years (2010-2017). As land has not been identified within the development limit, the Department have indicated within their March 2011 paper that a potential site/s in appropriate location/s may be considered in the context of Policy CTY 5 of PPS 21. We therefore conclude that there is no need for additional land to be included within the SDL to meet social housing needs.

### Sites Outside the Settlement Development Limit

- 2.6.5 A number of objections were received seeking parcels of land to be included within the proposed settlement development limit. Objection 330 sought the inclusion of land **north-west of Nos. 22 and 24 Station Road and north-east of Dunloy Presbyterian Church, Main Street**. Given that this objection site does not abut a public road, there is no obvious means of accessing the site. As there is a significant surplus of housing provision within the proposed development limit, there is also no need for this land to be included for residential purposes.
- 2.6.6 Objections 330, 4986 and 5102 requested the inclusion of land **adjacent, north-east and south-east of No.30 Bellaghy Road**. As this site has been granted planning permission for residential development (D/2005/0859/RM) and the Department have indicated that they have no objection to this area's inclusion within the proposed development limit, we recommend its inclusion and zoning for housing purposes.

- 2.6.7 Objections 330, 5115 and 5704 sought the inclusion of lands **north-west of No.31 Bellaghy Road**. Objections 330 and 5704 also requested the inclusion of the land **south-west of No.25 Bellaghy Road**. Objection 330 requested the inclusion of **No.31 and land south-east of No.31 Bellaghy Road**. Although planning permission has been granted on 25<sup>th</sup> June 2009 for the demolition of Nos. 25 and 27 Bellaghy Road and the erection of 8 dwelling units (D/2007/0454/F) and the land adjacent to No.30 Bellaghy Road (D/2005/0859/RM), the area to the west and south of Nos. 25 and 27 Bellaghy Road rises in a westerly direction, thus making any potential development prominent in the landscape. There is no need for any of these lands, even those areas along the roadside which are not elevated, to be included within the proposed development limit for housing purposes given the surplus supply of residential land in Dunloy.
- 2.6.8 Objection 330 requested the inclusion of **Nos. 140 and 142 Tullaghans Road and land east and west of Nos. 140 and 142 Tullaghans Road**. To include this land would expand the settlement limit further in a north-westerly direction, thus leading to further sprawl and would not contribute to achieving a compact urban form.
- 2.6.9 Objections 4721 and 4986 sought the inclusion of land **west of Housing Zoning DLH 03 on Bridge Road**. Objections 330 and 4986 requested the inclusion of land **south of Housing Zoning DLH 03** and objection 4986 also requested the inclusion of the area **south-west of DLH 03**. Objection 330 also requested the inclusion of **Nos. 4 and 5 Mallaboy Lane and No.63 Bridge Road**. Given the approval of residential development (D/2003/0654/F) to the south of Housing Zoning DLH 03 (2004/A018 allowed on appeal on 5<sup>th</sup> October 2004) and the fact that the Department indicated that they have no objection to the area approved being included within the proposed development limit, we recommend its inclusion and zoning for housing purposes. It is noted that planning permission has since been granted on 24<sup>th</sup> April 2007 (D/2006/0203/F) for a revised scheme on the site. There is however no need for the remaining area to be included within the proposed development limit for residential purposes given the surplus of housing opportunities within the proposed limit. The inclusion of the land at No.4 Mallaboy Lane and No.63 Bridge Road would also serve to elongate the settlement's urban form in a southerly direction, thus resulting in urban sprawl.
- 2.6.10 Objections 4721 and 5704 sought the inclusion of land **west of Housing Zoning DLH 03 on Bridge Road**. There is no strategic housing need within Dunloy to justify its inclusion given the extent of the surplus housing provision. Claims that the area is vulnerable to vandalism and anti-social behaviour and that the inclusion of the land could meet a shortfall in the provision of larger, lower density housing units/plots for families and provide retirement accommodation were unsubstantiated with persuasive evidence. The planning history on this site is also of little weight in this case given that the site was refused not only on the basis of prematurity to dNAP but also under Policy DES 3 of PSRNI in relation to concern about the proposal marring the settlement limit (D/2005/0993/O). We do not support the inclusion of this land within the SDL.

- 2.6.11 Objection 4846 requested the inclusion of lands **north and north-west of the playing field on Garryduff Road**. This long, extensive field is highly visible from the Garryduff Road and Tullaghans Road due to the elevation of the roads, the rising nature of the land in a south-westerly direction and the lack of adequate screening on the site. Any development here would therefore appear as a prominent feature in the landscape. Given that there is only significant built development along the south-western boundary of the land, development here would appear unrelated to the settlement's urban form and result in urban sprawl along the Garryduff Road. The exclusion of this land from the SDL is endorsed.
- 2.6.12 Objection 5704 requested the inclusion of land **opposite No.16 Carrowdoon Road**. Irrespective of the presence of the bridge and agricultural buildings to the east, the inclusion of this land would serve to elongate the settlement's form along Carrowadoon Road, thus resulting in the sprawling of Dunloy in an easterly direction. RFNo substantive evidence was presented to support the objector's claim that there is a shortage of larger detached dwellings for retirement aged people and families or that there is a need to address the socio-economic balance of Dunloy's population. The planning history on this site, with it having been refused planning permission on the grounds of prematurity to dNAP (D/2005/0109/O), does not assist the objector's argument.
- 2.6.13 Objection 5726 requested that lands at **No.20 Station Road** be zoned for housing purposes as they were available and viable for such use. No map however accompanied the objection to identify the land. It is noted that planning permission was granted on 26<sup>th</sup> July 2006 at No.20 Station Road to demolish an existing dwelling and erect 4 housing units (D/2005/0312/F). It would appear that 4 housing units have recently been constructed at No.20 Station Road. Given that the land appears to have developed, it would not be appropriate to zone it for residential use. Even if it were not developed, given the lack of sufficient information and abundance of housing land provision within the proposed development limit there is no need to zone additional lands for residential use.

### **Recommendation**

#### **2.6.14 We recommend that:**

- **The development limit of Dunloy be adjusted to include lands adjacent to No.30 Bellaghy Road (D/2005/0859/RM) and also the land at No.60 Bridge Road approved under D/2003/0654/F.**

### **HOUSING ZONINGS**

- 2.6.15 Objections 330 and 5704 objected to all the proposed housing zonings (Housing Zonings DLH 01-08) however these were unsubstantiated. The concern in relation to the retention of trees adversely impacting on the potential yield from Housing Zoning DLH 04 has been superseded by events as this site was granted planning permission for 17 residential units (D/2006/0452/F) on 30<sup>th</sup> June 2008. There should be no change to the Plan as a result of these objections.

## LOCAL LANDSCAPE POLICY AREA

- 2.6.16 Objections 330, 346 and 5704 objected to the designation of Dunloy South LLPA (DLL 01). Concerns in relation to the accuracy of this designation were unsubstantiated. The argument that the land was previously located within a non-policy area within NEAP does not preclude its inclusion now within the proposed designation. Objection 346 questioned the inclusion of **No.72 Bridge Road** and its associated farm buildings and lands. This vegetated area is visually significant in the local landscape at the entrance/exit to Dunloy along Bridge Road. It is noted in the Department's evidence that a number of urn burials were recovered from an area now occupied by ancillary farm buildings at No.72 Bridge Road which are of archaeological and historic interest. We therefore do not accept that the inclusion of this area has no significant merit. The inclusion of the area within a LLPA seeks to ensure that such environmental assets are protected in addition to the other material considerations that are taken into account as part of the assessment of a development proposal. There should be no change to the Plan as a result of these objections.

## 2.7 LOUGHGUILLE

### Provision for Housing and the Settlement Development Limit

- 2.7.1 Within the North East Area Plan (NEAP), Loughguile was designated as a hamlet. In recognition of its role as a local service centre, it is now proposed as a village within the draft Northern Area Plan (dNAP). Designation LE01 proposes a Settlement Development Limit (SDL) for Loughguile and this is identified on Map No. 2/07.
- 2.7.2 Taking account of the 2008 HGI revision for Ballymoney District the draft plan makes provision for 40 housing units in Loughguile however between January 1999 and August 2010 59 units were completed. The Housing Update Paper (March 2011) estimated that approximately 104 housing units could be accommodated within the settlement limit over the plan period; this would amount to a surplus of approximately 64 units (160%) above the plan allocation.

### Social Housing

- 2.7.3 The Department's Housing Update Paper (March 2011) states that there is no need for social housing units within Loughguile over the next 7 years (2010-2017).

### Sites Outside the Settlement Development Limit

- 2.7.4 A number of objections were received requesting that various parcels of land be included within the proposed settlement development limit. Objections 330, 4378 and 4926 requested that **No. 161 Colkeeran Road, lands surrounding it and north of it**, be included within the proposed development limit. This area includes a number of dwellings and agricultural buildings. Objections 4378 and 4926 also requested that lands to the **south of No. 161 Colkeeran Road** also be included within the development limit. Despite the presence of development opposite these lands, this development is mostly detached dwellings located in substantial plots. The objection lands appear removed from the core of the village and are viewed as part of the settlement's rural context. The lands to the south and the north of No. 161 Colkeeran Road are quite elevated and development here would appear prominent in the landscape. We do not consider that the inclusion of No. 161 Colkeeran Road and the outbuildings and area to the north would amount to rounding off given the extent of the lands, the lack of development to the south of these lands and its visual separation from Loughguile. To include this land would also necessitate the inclusion of the lands to the north of the Parochial House, in order to prevent an illogical settlement form, which would be unnecessary. We do not support the inclusion of any of this land within the SDL.
- 2.7.5 Objections 330 and 4962 sought the inclusion of land at the **junction of Corkey and Lough Roads, opposite No. 2 Corkey Road**. Objection 330 also requested the inclusion of the area to the south-east of this, opposite **No. 18 Corkey Road**. Objection 4962 also asked for the land to the south-west of the junction, **opposite the Millennium Centre and Parochial house**, to be included within the proposed development limit. This is a historically interesting

and sensitive area hence the presence of LLPA LEL 01 on parts of the lands of objection 4962 and on all of the area of objection 330. Incorporated within the land of objection 330 is a traditional farmstead; the buildings and some of the vegetation are thought to have been in place since at least 1857. The lands of objections 330 and 4962 contribute to the setting of this farmstead as well as that of the listed former school (No. 2 Corkey Road) and St Patrick's Roman Catholic Church. To include these lands would therefore be inappropriate given the adverse impact that it would have on these significant settlement features.

- 2.7.6 Objections 330, 348 and 5181 sought the inclusion of land **east and south of No. 32 Corkey Road**. Objection 330 and 5181 also objected to the non-inclusion of lands **east of Nos. 18-28 Corkey Road**. The inclusion of these lands would fail to promote a compact settlement form, facilitating further urban sprawl along Corkey Road which would be visually unacceptable. The extent of potential backland development that would be possible would also be out of keeping with the predominant roadside character of development in this area.
- 2.7.7 Objections 4378 and 5716 objected to the non-inclusion of lands **east of St Patrick's Primary School and east/north-east of Shelton Meadows, Shelton Road**. To include any of the objection lands would elongate the settlement form in a north-easterly direction thus resulting in urban sprawl. This would not contribute to achieving a compact urban form.
- 2.7.8 Objection 4986 requested that the lands to the **east of St Patrick's Roman Catholic Church** be included within the proposed development limit and be zoned for housing. This land has already been developed as Tullyview housing development.

### **HOUSING ZONINGS**

- 2.7.9 Objection 330's objections that housing zonings LEH 1, LEH 2 and LEH 03 are inadequate to meet demand are unsupported given the potential level of housing over provision.

### **ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT**

- 2.7.10 Objection 348 argued that there was a lack of zoned land for rural businesses, with no land being zoned for industry. They considered that this would have adverse social and economic consequences for Loughguile's residents and rural population, thus creating a stagnant settlement and forcing out migration. It has however already been concluded in the strategic section of the report that there is adequate industrial land within the Ballymoney Borough. We are therefore not persuaded that there is a need to zone land for industrial/business purposes within Loughguile.

### **COMMUNITY DESIGNATIONS AND OPEN SPACE**

- 2.7.11 Objection 330 stated that Community Designation LEC 01, Community Zoning LEC 02 and the area of open space do not accurately reflect the area to be covered by such designations/zonings and that they therefore need to be reassessed. Community Designation LEC 01 Millennium Centre is already

developed and NAP (Page 42, Volume Two, Part Four: Ballymoney Borough; Loughguile) states that it is designated in order to retain the existing community facilities. In terms of Community Zoning LEC 02, which seeks to zone land for future community development, no substantive evidence was presented to support the claim that the area was not accurately shown. As stated within Paragraph 4.1 (Page 43, Volume 2) of the draft Northern Area Plan and as illustrated in Map No. 2/07 – Loughguile, the major area of existing open space is shown for information purposes only. This area is a Gaelic sports ground and no persuasive evidence was presented that it is not accurately illustrated. There should be no change to the Plan as a result of these objections.

### **LOCAL LANDSCAPE POLICY AREA**

- 2.7.12 Objections 330 and 4962 objected to Designation LEL 01 St Patrick's Church LLPA. No substantive evidence was presented to support objection 330's claim that the designation is too extensive and we are satisfied that adequate reasoning for it is provided on Page 43 Volume 2 of the draft Northern Area Plan. In terms of the purpose of the LLPA designation LEL 01, Policy ENV 2 in Volume 1 of the plan clearly sets out how LLPAs seek to protect the environmental assets, listed on Page 43 of Volume 2 of the draft Northern Area Plan, from undesirable or damaging development. Objection 4962 objected to land on Lough Road, opposite the Millennium Centre and Parochial House, being partially included within Designation LEL 01 as they considered there to be no significant landscape features here. Specifically when approaching Loughguile from a westerly direction along Lough Road, these lands however contribute to the setting of St Patrick's Roman Catholic Church and the listed former school located to the north-west of the Church (No. 2 Corkey Road). The objection site is also located along the periphery of a traditional farmstead which has historic merit and architectural interest. Given the contribution that the objection lands make to Designation LEL 01 and the various features of the LLPA, we consider that they should remain within St Patrick's Church LLPA. There should be no change to the Plan as a result of these objections.

## 2.8 RASHARKIN

### Provision for Housing and the Settlement Development Limit

- 2.8.1 The North East Area Plan (NEAP) designated Rasharkin as a village and the Draft Northern Area Plan (dNAP) proposes to retain this designation. Designation RN01 proposes a Settlement Development Limit (SDL) for Rasharkin and this is identified on Map No. 2/08.
- 2.8.2 Taking account of the 2008 HGI revision for Ballymoney District the draft plan makes provision for 149 housing units in Rasharkin and between January 1999 and August 2010 103 units were completed. The Housing Update Paper (March 2011) estimated that approximately 303 housing units could be accommodated within the settlement limit over the plan period; this would amount to a surplus of approximately 154 units (103.4%) above the plan allocation.

### Social Housing

- 2.8.3 The Department's Housing Update Paper (March 2011) states that there is a need for 9 social housing units within Rasharkin over the next 7 years (2010-2017). As land has not been identified within the development limit, the Department have indicated within their March 2011 paper that a potential site/s in appropriate location/s may be considered in the context of Policy CTY 5 of PPS 21. We therefore conclude that there is no need for additional land to be included within the SDL to meet social housing needs.

### Sites Outside the Settlement Development Limit

- 2.8.4 A number of objections were received requesting that lands be included within the proposed settlement development limit. Objections 330 and 363 requested the inclusion of lands to the **rear and east of Nos. 1-10 Riverdale, Main Street and north-east of Nos. 37a-43 Main Street**. Planning approval has been implemented on part of this site for St.Olcan's Parish Centre, Gortahar Road (D/2009/0369/F and D/2010/0183/F). The Department stated that they have no objection to the area where the Parish Centre is located being included within the development limit and we concur with this recommendation. There is however no strategic need for the remaining area to be included within the proposed development limit for residential purposes.
- 2.8.5 Objection 330 requested the inclusion and zoning for housing of lands **east and south-east of No.140 Duneany Road**. Given the rural character of this attractive location, the development of these lands would appear unrelated to the settlement's form, elongating built development in an easterly direction thus resulting in urban sprawl.
- 2.8.6 Objection 330 requested the inclusion and zoning for residential purposes of lands **west and north-east of No.33 Moneyleck Road**. Both of these plots appear isolated from Rasharkin's urban form. The land west of No.33 Moneyleck Road lacks enclosure by mature vegetation along its south-west boundary. Access to the land located to the north-east of No.33 Moneyleck

- Road may be problematic due to its location at a sharp bend on Moneyleck Road.
- 2.8.7 Objection 363 highlighted on a map land **including and north-east of Housing Zoning RNH 10 and the major area of existing open space to the north-east of Carnfinton Park, Duneany Road**. Both the area of open space and Housing Zoning RNH 10 are located within the proposed development limit. In relation to the land north-east of RNH 10 there is a lack of strategic need for additional housing land. There should be no change to the Plan as a result of this objection.
- 2.8.8 Objection 4314 requested the inclusion of land **west of Housing Zoning RNH 04 Main Street**. They argued that Housing Zoning RNH 04 dissects the objector's land in half and therefore all of their land should be included within the proposed development limit. There is however no strategic need to include this land due to the generous amount of housing available within the proposed development limit. We therefore do not support the inclusion of this land within the SDL.
- 2.8.9 Objection 4448 sought the inclusion and zoning for residential purposes of lands **east of the junction of Glebe and Bann Roads, west of Housing Zoning RNH 13 and No.39 Church Road**. These lands provide an attractive entrance/exit to Rasharkin from the Bann Road. The development of this area would appear removed from the settlement's form. To include any of this land would unacceptably elongate the settlement in a south-westerly direction, resulting in urban sprawl. Development here would appear prominent in the landscape given its open nature. These lands should therefore remain outside the proposed development limit.
- 2.8.10 Objection 4571 requested the inclusion and zoning for housing of land **east of Rockland Crecent, Gortahar Road**. To include this elevated area would serve to elongate the settlement's form in a north-easterly direction and therefore would result in urban sprawl.
- 2.8.11 Objection 4695 sought the inclusion of land **north-east and north-west of No.19 Glebe Road and land south-east of No.54 Church Road, between Craigs Road and Church Lane**. There is no strategic housing need for either of these areas to be included within the proposed development limit. In relation to the land between Craigs Road and Church Lane, this extensive area is visually prominent at the entrance/exit to the village given its flat, open nature. To include this area would result in a southerly expansion of Rasharkin and would appear as urban sprawl. We do not support the inclusion of these lands within the SDL.
- 2.8.12 Objections 4986 and 5527 requested the inclusion and zoning for housing of land **north-east of Moneyleck Park, Finvoy Road**. Objection 5527 also requested the inclusion and zoning for housing of land **north of No.300 Finvoy Road, north-east of Moneyleck Park and opposite Moneyleck House, Finvoy Road**, to the north-west of Rockland Crescent, Gortahar Road. There is no strategic housing need for either of these areas to be included within the proposed development limit. In relation to the land north of No.300 and opposite Moneyleck House, Finvoy Road, to include this area would result in a

substantial expansion and elongation of the settlement in a northerly direction resulting in urban sprawl. To include this land would also necessitate the inclusion of the land north-east of Moneyleck Park and to the north-west of St. Mary's Roman Catholic Church so that a 'donut effect' would not be created in the settlement's form. The exclusion of these lands from the SDL is endorsed.

### **Recommendation**

#### **2.8.13 We recommend that:**

- **The area of St.Olcan's Parish Centre, Gortahar Road be included within the settlement development limit**

### **HOUSING ZONINGS**

2.8.14 Due to the potential level of housing provision which the proposed development limit allows, we are not persuaded by objection 330's argument that the proposed housing zonings are inadequate to meet demand. Objection 5599 raised concern in relation to the creation of a new entry between Bamford Park and Carnfinton Park and the potential removal of trees on site however given that the Department has indicated that housing zoning RNH 10 has extant planning permission for 9 dwellings, which was approved on 23<sup>rd</sup> April 2009 (D/2005/0530/F), this objection is unsupported. Concern that the retention of the trees (KSR No.2) in relation to Housing Zoning RNH 12 would adversely affect the housing yield from the site and should therefore be reassessed is not supported given the contribution that they make to the environment and the attractiveness of this location. Objection 330's issues in relation to housing zoning RNH 13 being located within Designation RNL 02 Glebe LLPA and its impact that this would have especially in terms of potential yield have been superseded by events as it was granted planning permission on 25<sup>th</sup> August 2010 for the erection of 46 dwellings (D/2007/0041/F). KSR No.2 of Housing Zoning RNH 14 highlights that the development of the site may require additional lands in order to provide access to Church Road. However, this is an issue that could be resolved by a potential developer and we do not consider that this requirement requires the proposed zoning to be reassessed. The objections are therefore unsupported.

### **INDUSTRIAL DESIGNATION**

2.8.15 Objections 330, 4754 and 5585 objected to Industrial Designation RNI 01. Given that the site has been approved for housing purposes on 27<sup>th</sup> May 2010 (D/2006/0493/F), the Department consider that there is no benefit in retaining this designation. We concur with this position and recommend that the land be left as whiteland within the proposed development limit. Given the lack of strategic need for additional housing land, we do not consider it necessary to zone it for housing. By leaving it as whiteland, a range of development proposals may be considered on the site should the housing development proposal not proceed. Objection 330 stated that the land zoned as existing industrial land was inadequate and drastically reduces the potential for investors to establish businesses in the area. They considered this to have serious implications for employment opportunities and, as a result, requested that more land be zoned for industrial development purposes. The industrial

designation was only shown for information purposes and reflected the fact that the site was in general industrial use. Given the status of Rasharkin as a village, it would be inappropriate to zone land here for industrial purposes; this would be best located within the plan area's main towns.

### **Recommendation**

#### **2.8.16 We recommend that:**

- **Industrial Zoning RNI 01 should be removed and the area should become whiteland.**

### **COMMUNITY DESIGNATION**

2.8.17 Objections 330 and 363 objected to Community Zoning RNC 01 however as this area was approved for residential development purposes (D/2007/0018/RM) on 30<sup>th</sup> March 2009, the Department stated that they have no objection to the removal of the proposed zoning. Given this planning history, we agree that it would be inappropriate for Community Zoning RNC 01 to remain. We suggest that this area be left as whiteland as this would allow more development options should the housing proposal not proceed. Objection 330 also stated that the major area of existing open space did not accurately reflect the area to be covered and that it needed to be re-assessed. As no substantive evidence was provided to support this claim, no change to the Plan is recommended as a result of this objection.

### **Recommendation**

#### **2.8.18 We therefore recommend that:**

- **Community Zoning RNC 01 should be removed and the area should become whiteland.**

### **LOCAL LANDSCAPE POLICY AREAS**

2.8.19 Objections 330, 363, 4448 and 4986 raised a number of objections in relation to the proposed LLPAs. There was a lack of substantive evidence as to why the LLPAs should not be designated or why specific areas should not be included within the various LLPAs. Simply because an area was not previously designated within a LLPA does not justify its exclusion now. As stated earlier, we are not persuaded that there is an automatic conflict between land identified within the proposed development limit and being designated within a LLPA. Paragraph 6.1 (Page 48, dNAP, Volume 2, Part 4: Ballymoney Borough; Rasharkin) states that any development proposals within these areas will be considered within the terms of Policy ENV 2 in Volume 1 of the Plan. It is noted however that at the Public Examination the Department indicated that they propose to amend the extent of Designation RNL 02 Glebe Road due to the potential impact of the development of Housing Zoning RNH 13 (D/2007/0041/F).

## 2.9 STRANOCUM

### Provision for Housing and the Settlement Development Limit

- 2.9.1 Stranocum was designated as a hamlet within the North East Area Plan (NEAP) however in recognition of its role as a local service centre, it is proposed as a village within the draft Northern Area Plan (dNAP). Designation SM01 proposes a Settlement Development Limit (SDL) for Stranocum and this is identified on Map No. 2/09.
- 2.9.2 Taking account of the 2008 HGI revision for Ballymoney District the draft plan makes provision for 48 housing units in Stranocum and between January 1999 and August 2010 13 units were completed. The Housing Update Paper (March 2011) estimated that approximately 88 housing units could be accommodated within the settlement limit over the plan period; this would amount to a surplus of approximately 40 units (83.3%) above the plan allocation.

### Social Housing

- 2.9.3 The Department's Housing Update Paper (March 2011) states that there is no need for social housing units within Stranocum over the next 7 years (2010-2017).

### Sites Outside the Settlement Development Limit

- 2.9.4 A number of objections were received requesting that specific parcels of land be included within the proposed settlement development limit. Objections 329, 330, 4949 and 5056 sought the inclusion of lands to the **west of Nos. 32A-44 Main Street**. Given that there is only built development to the east and housing zoning SMH 01 to the south, with the western and northern areas being free from development, we do not accept that the inclusion of this land would amount to rounding off or that the proposed limit is disjointed or incoherent at this location. There is no strategic housing need for this land to be included within the proposed development limit. The exclusion of this land from the SDL is endorsed.
- 2.9.5 Objection 329 objected to the exclusion of land **behind Willowbank Terrace, Main Street**. With only development present on the eastern boundary, its inclusion would be out of keeping with the settlement's form.
- 2.9.6 Objection 330 objected to the exclusion of **No.142 Main Street and its associated land**. To include this land would serve to elongate the settlement in a south-westerly direction, thus leading to urban sprawl.
- 2.9.7 Objection 330 requested that **No. 143 Main Street and its associated land** be included within the proposed development limit. Located at the south-western end of Stranocum, this wooded area presents an attractive entrance to the settlement. To include this land would serve to elongate the settlement in a south-westerly direction, thus leading to urban sprawl.
- 2.9.8 Objection 4320 objected to the partial exclusion of their lands **east of the Cornmill** from the proposed development limit. As acknowledged by

Paragraph 1.2 (page 50, dNAP, Volume 2, Part 4: Ballymoney Borough; Stranocum), Chestnutts Cornmill is the main source of local employment in the area. The position of the development limit does not impact on any existing approved or established uses on site. To expand the development limit to include all of the objection land however may jeopardise this environmentally sensitive area which is located within the proposed LLPA SML 01 and which includes the fish farm. To include this area within the proposed development limit would provide a presumption in favour of development which would be at odds with Paragraph 4.2 (page 52, dNAP, Volume 2, Part 4: Ballymoney Borough; Stranocum) which states that the only acceptable development in LLPA SML 01 will be that required to facilitate efficient farm operations. Any specific proposal that the objector may have in the future, however, would be best dealt with by the development management process and therefore assessed on its own merits. There should be no change to the Plan as a result of this objection.

## **LOCAL LANDSCAPE POLICY AREA**

- 2.9.9 Objection 4320 objected to their lands being partially included within Designation SML 01: Bush Valley LLPA. The objector argued that the designation divided buildings and the yard areas in an arbitrary manner, ignoring the established operations of their business. The objector considers that the statement within Paragraph 4.2 (page 52 of dNAP, Volume 2), that ‘the only acceptable development in this LLPA will be that required to facilitate efficient farm operations’ illustrated that the designation was entirely inappropriate and seriously disadvantaged their business. The Department’s evidence for the Public Examination provides further details justifying Designation SML 01. This states that the LLPA includes archaeological sites from the settlement’s industrial heritage comprising the old Cornmill, Scotch Mill and Mill Race; the riverbanks comprising River Bush and the associated open space (Riverside Park and picnic area) and former fish farm; views from Livery Road of the village and Stranocum Hall. This additional information provides further clarification in relation to why the designation has included the objector’s lands and it should be included, at the very least, within the draft Northern Area Plan’s amplification text to Designation SML 01. It is noted, however, that the main Cornmill Buildings and surrounding area are excluded from Designation SML 01 which may provide the business a degree of flexibility. Whilst it is appreciated that such additional controls may not be welcomed by the objector, they are considered necessary in order to protect the site’s rich industrial heritage, the river banks, former fish farm and views across the lands from Livery Road. Whilst it is welcomed that the objector carried out extensive planting within their site, the suggestion of locating the LLPA boundary approximately 5m from the river bank is not supported in this instance. No substantive evidence was presented by objection 330 to support their claim that Designation SML 01 was too expansive and not truly reflective of the lands eligible for protection.

## **AREA OF CONSTRAINT ON MINERALS DEVELOPMENT**

- 2.9.10 Objection 330 objected to the ‘Area of Constraint on Mineral Development’ illustrated on Map 2/09-Stranocum. Designation COU 16 Areas of Constraint on Minerals Development however has been withdrawn.

## 2.10 SMALL SETTLEMENTS

2.10.1 The draft Plan identifies eight small settlements within the Ballymoney District: Bendooragh, Bushvale, Carneately/Lislagan, Corkey, Derrykeighan, Dunaghy, Finvoy and Magherahoney. As previously discussed within the strategic section of the report, we consider that any extension of the SDL will only be recommended where we are satisfied that there are urban form arguments or other factors that would justify an exception being made.

### BENDOORAGH

2.10.2 Bendooragh was designated as a hamlet in the North East Area Plan and the draft Plan proposes that it is retained as a small settlement. Designation BG01 proposes a Settlement Development Limit (SDL) for Bendooragh and this is identified on Map No. 2/10. The Department's Housing Update Paper (March 2011) states that there is a need for 7 social housing units within Bendooragh over the next 7 years (2010-2017). As land has not been identified within the development limit, the Department have indicated within their March 2011 paper that a potential site/s in appropriate location/s may be considered in the context of Policy CTY 5 of PPS 21. We therefore conclude that there is no need for additional land to be included within the SDL to meet social housing needs.

2.10.3 The draft Plan proposes to consolidate Bendooragh's settlement limit with a minor extension to include the Cabra Court housing development. Given our strategic conclusions, objectors 330 and 5613's claim that the settlement's designation is too restrictive, limiting its future growth, is therefore not supported. Their claim that the open space zonings do not accurately reflect the area's requirements was unsubstantiated and therefore not supported.

### Sites Outside the Settlement Development Limit

2.10.4 Various pieces of land were suggested as possible inclusions within the settlement. Objection 329 sought the inclusion of land to the **south/south-west of Nos. 11-17 Bendooragh Road**. This site has been developed and is already incorporated into the draft settlement limit.

2.10.5 Objection 330's request that the open space zoning BGO 01 should be within the settlement limit was unsubstantiated with persuasive evidence. There should be no change to the Plan as a result of this objection.

2.10.6 Objection 330 opposed the exclusion of **Nos. 93 and 95 Bann Road** and associated lands. The sites however contain two detached properties within mature grounds. The vegetation and river located along the north-eastern boundary of No.93 provide a defensible settlement boundary that should not be breached.

2.10.7 Objection 330 sought the inclusion of **No.14 Bendooragh Road** and its associated land. The site contains a B&B establishment and a number of agricultural style buildings. The laneway located along the northern boundary of the site acts as a natural boundary for the settlement. To include this land would serve to elongate the urban form of the settlement.

- 2.10.8 Objection 330 sought the inclusion of land to the rear of **Nos. 10 and 12 Bendooragh Road**. The inclusion of this land would unnecessarily elongate Bendooragh in an easterly direction.
- 2.10.9 Objection 330 opposed the exclusion of **No.74 Bann Road** and its associated land. The site contains a detached bungalow and side field. To include this land would unnecessarily elongate the settlement in a north-easterly direction.
- 2.10.10 Objection 4325 sought the inclusion of land to the **north-east of No.81 Bann Road**. There is residential development located opposite the proposed land. Given that the extensive size of the site and the fact that it is located on the edge of the settlement, it would not represent either limited rounding-off or infilling. We do not support the inclusion of this land within the SDL.
- 2.10.11 Objections 4325 and 5056 sought the inclusion of land to the **north-west of Nos. 91 and 91a Bann Road**. Claims that the existing NEAP and proposed NAP settlement limit is visually unsightly at this location is of little consequence given the limited public views. The location of this substantial objection site on the edge of Bendooragh does not, however, amount to limited infilling or rounding-off. The achievement of planning permission on the neighbouring site, said to be under the objector's control, illustrates that both this land and the objector's site could be developed independently. There should be no change to the Plan as a result of these objections.
- 2.10.12 Objection 4714 sought the inclusion of land **opposite No.14 Bendooragh Road**. The inclusion of this extensive field would serve to extend the settlement's form in a south-easterly direction. Such a proposal would also not amount to limited infilling or rounding off and it is appropriately excluded from the settlement.

### **BUSHVALE**

- 2.10.13 While Bushvale was not designated as a settlement in the extant NEAP, it has been designated as a small settlement within the draft Plan. Designation BU01 proposes a Settlement Development Limit (SDL) for Bushvale and this is identified on Map No. 2/11. Given our strategic conclusions, objectors 330 and 5613's claim that the settlement designation is too restrictive, limiting its future growth, is therefore unsupported.
- 2.10.14 Objection 330 sought the inclusion of **No.97a Fivey Road** and its associated land. This small site contains a detached property set within mature grounds however it is divorced from the proposed draft Plan limit. There should be no change to the Plan as a result of this objection.

### **CARNEATLY/LISLAGAN**

- 2.10.15 Carneatly/Lislagan was not designated as a settlement in the extant NEAP; it has been designated as a small settlement within the draft Plan. Objections 2224 and 5613 objection to the settlement being referred to as 'Carneatly' rather than 'Lislagan' was accepted by the Department. Designation CY01 proposes a Settlement Development Limit (SDL) for Carneatly and this is identified on Map No. 2/12. Objections 330, 2224, 5613 and 5621 made

generic claims that the proposed limit is too restrictive however given our strategic conclusions, the objectors claims are unsupported. Objection 330 raised concern that the plan was inconsistent in relation to open space in Carnealy/Lislagan. Section 2.1 (p.55) in Volume 2 Part 4 of the Plan states that the Plan identifies major areas of existing open space for information purposes and that the relevant policies are contained within PPS 8: Open Space, Sport and Outdoor Recreation. Whilst Section 2 appears to be superfluous as there is no open space identified in the settlement, we do not consider that this warrants the open space in the area to be reassessed. No substantiated evidence was provided to support the claim that it does not reflect the need for such a use. In order to prevent confusion, we, however, suggest that Section 2.0 entitled 'Open Space' be deleted from Volume 2 Part 4 of the Plan.

### **Recommendations**

#### **2.10.16 We recommend that:**

- **The settlement be referred to as Lislagan**
- **Section 2.0 Open Space within Volume 2 Part 4 be deleted from the Plan.**

### **Sites Outside the Settlement Development Limit**

2.10.17 Various pieces of land were suggested as possible inclusions within the settlement. Objections 330, 4986 and 5621 sought the inclusion of lands **west of Thornleigh Park** with objections 330 and 5621 also asking for the inclusion of land to the **east of Lislagan Primary School**. Each of these proposed areas would approximately double the size of the proposed settlement. Claims that some of this land could be used as a parking facility for Lislagan Primary School in order to alleviate traffic and parking issues were unsubstantiated by the objector or the school authority. There is no strategic housing need for any of these parcels of land to be included within the limit.

2.10.18 Objection 2224 requested that land to the **north/north-west of Thornleigh Park and Torrens Park and No.35 Bravellen Road** be included within the settlement limit in order to provide housing, recreational and green areas. As stated previously, there is no strategic need for additional land to be identified within the settlement limit.

### **CORKEY**

2.10.19 Corkey was not designated as a settlement in the extant NEAP; it has, however, been designated as a small settlement within the draft Plan. Designation CO01 proposes a Settlement Development Limit (SDL) for Corkey and this is identified on Map No. 2/13. As previously concluded within the strategic section of the report, objections 329, 330 and 5613's claim that the settlement's designation is too restrictive, limiting its future growth and resulting in the migration of the area's population and affordability issues are not persuasive. The Department's Housing Update Paper (March 2011) states that there is a need for 6 social housing units within Corkey over the next 7 years

(2010-2017). As land has not been identified within the development limit, the Department have indicated within their March 2011 paper that a potential site/s in appropriate location/s may be considered in the context of Policy CTY 5 of PPS 21. We therefore conclude that there is no need for additional land to be included within the SDL to meet social housing needs. Objection 330's claim that the open space zoning does not accurately reflect the area's requirements was unsubstantiated and therefore not supported. Objection 330 also questioned the extent and reasoning behind designation COL 01 Kilagan Water LLPA, however these concerns were not substantiated with persuasive evidence. There should be no change to the Plan as a result of these objections.

### **Sites Outside the Settlement Development Limit**

- 2.10.20 Various pieces of land were suggested as possible inclusions within the settlement. Objections 329 and 330 sought the inclusion of land surrounding and including **No.184 Corkey Road**, to the north-east of Ballure Heights. Given the size of this site, its inclusion would result in a substantial extension to the proposed settlement limit. Its elevated nature would result in significant housing development appearing visually prominent within the landscape. Its inclusion is unwarranted in order to distinguish between town and country and given its location at the edge of the settlement, we do not consider that it would amount to its rounding-off.
- 2.10.21 Objection 330 sought the inclusion of **No.186 Corkey Road** and its associated land. Given its elevated nature, this land is visually prominent when approaching Corkey from a southerly direction.
- 2.10.22 Objection 5550 asked that land to the **north-west of Corkey** be included within the proposed settlement limit. Given the considerable distance between the land and the proposed limit and the lack of strategic need for such an extensive expansion, it is not considered appropriate to include it.

### **DERRYKEIGHAN**

- 2.10.23 Derrykeighan was not designated as a settlement in the extant NEAP; it has, however, been designated as a small settlement within the draft Plan. Designation DK01 proposes a Settlement Development Limit (SDL) for Derrykeighan and this is identified on Map No. 2/14. Given our strategic conclusions, objections 330, 4917 and 5613's claim that the settlement's limit is too restrictive, limiting its future growth are not determining. Objection 330 objected to the open space zoning within Derrykeighan and stated that it does not accurately reflect the area's requirements; there is, however, no open space proposal within the settlement.
- 2.10.24 Objection 330 questioned the extent and reasoning for designation DKL 01 Derrykeighan LLPA, raising concern that it contravened the nature of the settlement limit and that there was a need to extend the settlement limit to compensate for the loss of development land. Designation DKL 01 aims to protect the environmental quality of the area including the significant groups of trees and remains of a historic church which is of benefit to the character of the settlement. There was little substantive evidence to justify the concerns in

relation to the designation or the need for it to be reassessed. As an LLPA does not preclude all development but only that which would damage the integrity of the LLPA, the designation alone would not merit the extension of the settlement limit. Objection 4519 sought the land located between **Nos. 327a and 329 Moyarget Road** to be included and protected as a part of the LLPA. The LLPAs include areas considered to be of greatest amenity value, landscape quality or local significance. Given the limited attractiveness of this area, it is not considered appropriate to include or protect it as a LLPA. There should be no change to the Plan as a result of these objections.

### **Sites Outside the Settlement Development Limit**

- 2.10.25 Various pieces of land were suggested as possible inclusions within the settlement. Objections 330 and 4917 sought the inclusion of **Nos. 186 and 186a Castlecat Road** and the associated land. This site provides a very attractive entrance to the proposed settlement and adds to its overall character. The Moyarget Road, to the north of the site, and its junction with Castlecat Road acts as a natural boundary to the limit.
- 2.10.26 Objection 4986 sought the land opposite **No.166 Castlecat Road** and to the **north of Glebe Park** to be included within the proposed settlement limit. To include this land would unsatisfactorily extend the settlement's form in a northerly direction and would not result in limited rounding off or infilling. It is appropriately excluded from the settlement.

### **DUNAGHY**

- 2.10.27 Dunaghy was not designated as a settlement within the North East Area Plan (NEAP) but rather was located within the Green Belt. dNAP proposed to designate Dunaghy as a small settlement however at Stage One of the Public Examination, the Department stated that the settlement's facilities were in line with those of a village. We concur with this recommendation. Designation DY01 proposes a Settlement Development Limit (SDL) for Dunaghy and this is identified on Map No. 2/15.
- 2.10.28 Given that Dunaghy was initially designated as a small settlement within dNAP, it did not have any land zoned for residential purposes. The Department however calculated the settlement's housing allocation entitlement as a 'village'. It was estimated that there would be a minor deficit of 9 units in terms of housing allocation. Given the minor deficit in the housing provision allocation, the historic build rates and the general over-provision of housing land throughout the District, we have already concluded strategically that the SDL should not be significantly extended. The presence of the lignite resource in the area also does not justify the need to allocate significant additional housing land in order to compensate for any restriction which it may have on the rural community, especially given the close proximity of the District's main town, Ballymoney.
- 2.10.29 Objection 330 objected to the open space zoning within Dunaghy, questioning its accuracy, however this concern was unsubstantiated and the 'major area of existing open space' was shown for information purposes only. Likewise, objection 330's concern in relation to the proposed protected route designation

was unsubstantiated and at any rate, this information was shown for information purposes; its designation is beyond the remit of the area plan. Objection 5424 objected to the inclusion of land to the **south and east of No.81 Kilraghts Road** within BYL 05 Greenville LLPA. Although this objection was not substantiated, the said land is not actually located within any LLPA designation.

### **Sites Outside the Settlement Development Limit**

- 2.10.30 A number of objections were received requesting that areas of land be included within the proposed settlement development limit. Objections 330, 4367, 4986 and 5704 sought the inclusion of land **east of No.92 Kilraghts Road**. Objections 330, 4367 and 5704 also requested the inclusion of land **opposite the junction of Landhead Road and Kilraghts Road**. The objections sought the land to be zoned for residential purposes and objection 5704 also suggested that it could be zoned for a community or for commercial purposes. This flat agricultural area is relatively prominent due to its poor boundary definition and therefore lacks screening. To develop any of these lands would have an adverse impact on the settlement's urban form which essentially comprises of three nodes of development. To include these lands would result in the elongation of the western node in an easterly direction and thus result in the merging of the two nodes. There was no social housing need identified by the Department in relation to Dunaghy. No persuasive evidence was presented to support the zoning of these lands for other purposes. We do not support the inclusion of these lands within the SDL.
- 2.10.31 Objection 330 sought the inclusion and zoning for housing of land **south, south-west, south-east of and including No.110 Kilraughts Road**. The lands are visually prominent given their flat, open nature. Their inclusion would also be unacceptable in relation to the settlement's urban form as they would result in a significant elongation of the most eastern node.
- 2.10.32 Objection 330 requested the inclusion and zoning for housing of lands including and **south, east and north of No.15 Landhead Road**. To include this area would cause an unacceptable sprawling of the settlement in a southerly direction, with development here appearing removed from Dunaghy's core.
- 2.10.33 Objections 330, 4367 and 5704 requested that land **south of the playing field at Landhead Road** be included within the proposed development limit and be zoned for residential purposes. Objection 5704 also requested that the land be zoned for community or commercial purposes however no substantive evidence was presented to support this request. To include this land within the development limit would result in a further expansion of the settlement in a southerly direction and would not contribute to achieving a compact urban form. No substantive evidence was submitted to justify the suggestion that existing open space located at the edge of a settlement's development limit should be excluded the proposed limit. No social housing need was identified by the Department in relation to Dunaghy.
- 2.10.34 Objections 330 and 4367 sought the inclusion of land to the **west of the playing field at Landhead Road opposite Nos. 82-92 Kilraghts Road**.

Whilst objection 330 have within their submission described this land as ‘east of the playing fields’, the accompanying map clearly indicates the land to the west and at any rate, the land to the east is already developed. To include this extensive land would result in a substantial elongating of the settlement’s southern node, causing it to sprawl in a westerly direction, merging it with the western node which would be unacceptable in relation to Dunaghy’s urban form.

2.10.35 Objection 5424 sought the inclusion of land **south and east of No.81 Kilraghts Road**. Whilst the written element of the objection states that they object to Ballymoney’s development limit, the accompanying map clearly indicates the described lands. Objection 330 also requested the inclusion of the roadside element of these objection lands. To include these extensive lands would result in a substantial sprawling of the settlement in a southerly direction which would be unacceptable in terms of urban form.

2.10.36 Objections 4367, 5467 and 5704 requested the inclusion of land **north of Nos. 68 and 70 Kilraghts Road to the west of Landsdale Gardens**. The development of this secluded modest area would have a minimal visual impact. In terms of urban form, development here would blend into the settlement and appear as ‘rounding off’ given its location between existing housing to the east and south and the screened Ballymoney River to the west. Access may also be achieved via the existing residential development at Landsdale Gardens thus reducing the visual impact of any development on the site. The inclusion of this land could also potentially eliminate or at least reduce the small housing shortfall within the settlement. Given the level of screening of the site, its modest size and acceptability in terms of urban form, the inclusion of this land is therefore recommended. Given this recommendation, there is no need to comment on other arguments presented by the objectors. As the Department indicated at the Public Examination that some development could occur here without impinging on the floodplain, the Department could assess the extent of the flood risk at the Development Management stage.

2.10.37 Objections 5052, 5053 and 5516 requested the inclusion of land **south of Nos. 101-109 Kilraghts Road**. Objection 5052 also sought the inclusion of land **south of Nos. 113-115 Kilraghts Road**. It was requested that these lands be zoned for housing purposes. To include these extensive lands would result in a south-easterly expansion of the settlement into the countryside which would not consolidate its urban form.

### **Recommendation**

**2.10.38 We recommend that:**

- **The area north of Nos. 68 and 70 Kilraghts Road, west of Landsdale Gardens (objections 4367, 5467 and 5704) be included within the proposed settlement development limit.**

### **FINVOY**

2.10.39 Finvoy was not designated as a settlement in the extant NEAP; it has, however, been designated as a small settlement within the draft Plan. Designation FV01

proposes a Settlement Development Limit (SDL) for Finvoy and this is identified on Map No. 2/16. Given our conclusions within the strategic section of the report, objections 330 and 5613 argument that the proposed limit is too restrictive is unsupported. Objection 330's claim that the open space zoning does not accurately reflect the area's requirements was unsubstantiated.

- 2.10.40 Objections 330, 5059 and 5583 objected to the extent of FVL 01 Finvoy LLPA however as these objections were unsubstantiated with detailed supporting evidence the objections are unsupported. Objection 330 requested that additional land be included within the proposed settlement limit to compensate for the loss of potential development land to the LLPA however little substantive evidence was submitted to support this assertion. Objection 5059 requested that their land at **No.159 Finvoy Road** be excluded from the designation however this was unjustified. Objection 5583 requested that land **south and west of Finvoy Church of Ireland Parish Church and No.157A Finvoy Road** be excluded from FVL 01 Finvoy LLPA. From the Dirraw Road, this area allows views across to Finvoy Parish Church which is the focus of the designation and which we accept to be a locally significant church of visual merit and of archaeological and historic interest. This land contributes not only to the views and setting of this church but also to the settlement of Finvoy. We therefore do not accept the arguments that it does not warrant inclusion within the LLPA designation. In relation to the argument that the land should be excluded like another area to the south, each area has to be assessed on its own merits. There should be no change to the Plan as a result of these objections.

### **Sites Outside the Settlement Development Limit**

- 2.10.41 Various pieces of land were suggested as possible inclusions within the settlement. Objection 330 objected to the exclusion of **No.3 Tullaghans Road** and its associated land. To include this land would elongate the settlement form in an easterly direction, not resulting in limited infilling and rounding-off.
- 2.10.42 Objection 330 requested the inclusion of land between **Nos. 167 and 169 Finvoy Road**. Development on this land would visually prominent and we do not support the inclusion of this land within the SDL.
- 2.10.43 Objection 5059 requested that the land at **No.159 Finvoy Road** be zoned for housing or whiteland. This land is located within the proposed settlement limit and in order to allow a degree of flexibility in all the small settlements no land is zoned for a specific use within any of the proposed limits.
- 2.10.44 Objection 5583 sought the inclusion of land to the **west of Nos. 157a and 159 Finvoy Road**. Rather than inclusion of this land resulting in a natural, defensible boundary for the settlement limit, it would serve to elongate Finvoy in a westerly direction.

**MAGHERAHONEY**

- 2.10.45 Magherahoney was not designated as a settlement in the extant NEAP. It has, however, been designated as a small settlement within the draft Plan. Designation MY01 proposes a Settlement Development Limit (SDL) for Magherahoney and this is identified on Map No. 2/17. There are opportunities, especially in the middle of the settlement, for some small scale development. Objections 330 and 5613 argued that the proposed limit is too restrictive however given our strategic conclusions these are unsupported. Objection 330's claim that the open space zoning does not accurately reflect the area's requirements was unsubstantiated. Objections 330 and 4986 objected to the extent and consequences of Designation MYL 01 designation. As an LLPA only precludes inappropriate development, its designation alone does not warrant extending the settlement limit. The other concerns raised in relation to Designation MYL 01 were unsubstantiated and are therefore not determining. There should be no change to the Plan as a result of these objections.
- 2.10.46 Objection 4986 sought the inclusion of land to the **north of Erinvale Park** within the settlement limit; this land is included within the proposed limit. The suggestion that the land be zoned for housing would not be appropriate given the settlement's status and the need to allow flexibility in terms of the land's potential uses.

## BALLYMONEY COUNTRYSIDE

- 2.11.1 Objection 4563 queried why their suggested SLNCI designations were not designated however in the absence of specific details we are not in a position to make an assessment of the merits of such designations. Objection 330 questioned the SLNCI designations and whether they were truly reflective of the lands eligible for protection; these objections however were unsubstantiated.
- 2.11.2 A number of objections were received in relation the HPGs designated by the plan. Little substantive evidence was provided by the objectors to justify why these areas should not be designated or why their extent should be reduced. However, as discussed earlier within the report, it is noted that at the Examination the Department tabled an amended boundary for Leslie Hill HPG which would effectively exclude the eastern area where development has already occurred or was considered to have commenced.
- 2.11.3 Within the strategic section of this report it was acknowledged that the Department accepted the principle of conferring settlement status at the **Drones/Fivey/Ballyveely Road** junctions area subject to consideration of the scope and extent of the SDL. Objection 5429 requested that a substantial area to the **north-west of Fernbank Park** be included with the limit and zoned for housing purposes. We do not however consider that there is a need or justification to include such an extensive area. The Department, however, indicated its willingness to accept the SDL definition forwarded in objection 5054; we concur with that suggestion.
- 2.11.4 A number of objections were received requesting that various areas of land be identified for development. No substantive evidence was provided by objection 5589 to support the assertion that an area, **adjacent to Ben Vista, Corkey Road, Corkey**, should be identified to provide a small complex of bungalows for older people and pensioners. As stated earlier within this report, there is no need for further land to be identified for housing purposes at Corkey, let alone for such a specific section of the population. This site is located within the countryside, far removed from the proposed settlement development limit of Corkey thus making it inappropriate to consider it as a possible extension of the settlement. Objection 4362 requested that land at **Drumlee Road, Finvoy** be identified for development. This area is removed from a proposed development limit and there is no strategic need for additional housing land to be identified within this locality. No substantive evidence was provided by objection 5743 to support their request that lands at **No.150 Bann Road, Ballymoney**, which are located within the open countryside, be identified for mixed use development. There should be no changes to the Plan as a result of these objections.
- 2.11.5 Objection 2500 sought the protection of **Roseyard Presbyterian Church, Kirk Road, Stranocum**; they were concerned in relation to the potential impact of the lignite resource area on their church, hall and graveyard. We considered the issue of the identification of the lignite resource area in our strategic report and concluded that Designation COU 15 should remain; we cannot therefore support the objection. The issue of identifying the church property as an historic site is a separate matter and one that is outside the development plan process. We note though that the Department helpfully indicated at the

Examination that NIEA was willing to discuss this issue with the objector as a separate process.

**Recommendation**

**2.11.6 We recommend that:**

- **The new settlement for the Drones/Fivey/Ballyveely Road junctions area be identified as per objection 5054.**