Planning Appeals Commission

Appeal Decision

4th Floor
92 Ann Street
BELFAST
BT1 3HH
T: 028 9024 4710
E: info@pacni.gov.uk

Appeal Reference:	2021/A0231
Appeal by:	Cityside Developments Ltd.
Appeal against:	The refusal of full planning permission
Proposed Development:	Redevelopment of site to erect 12 apartments and ancillary/ associated works
Location:	72 – 78A Connsbrook Avenue, Belfast
Planning Authority:	Belfast City Council
Application Reference:	LA04/2021/2017/F
Procedure:	Written representations and Commissioner's site visit on 25th November 2022
Decision by:	Commissioner Gareth Kerr, dated 14th December 2022

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and full planning permission is granted, subject to the conditions set out below.

Reasons

2. The main issues in this appeal are whether the proposal would harm local character and residential amenity.

3. The Planning Act (Northern Ireland) 2011 states that regard must be had to the local development plan (LDP), so far as material to the application, and to any other material considerations. Where regard is to be had to the LDP, the determination must be made in accordance with the plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. In 2017, the purported adoption of the Belfast Metropolitan Area Plan 2015 (BMAP) was declared unlawful by the Court of Appeal. This means the previous Belfast Urban Area Plan 2001 (BUAP) acts as the LDP for this area. A further consequence of the above judgement is that the draft Belfast Metropolitan Area Plan (dBMAP), published in 2004, is a material consideration in the appeal.

4. In both the BUAP and dBMAP, the site is unzoned land within the development limit of Belfast. The housing strategy of the BUAP promotes the use of suitable land for housing, particularly within the inner city. dBMAP aims to secure higher density development within urban areas while protecting the quality of the urban environment, particularly the character, amenity and environmental quality of established residential areas. The appeal proposal for redevelopment of a corner block with 12 apartments would accord with the above plans in principle, but must also be assessed under more detailed regional policy for quality residential environments.

5. The Strategic Planning Policy Statement for Northern Ireland (SPPS) sets out transitional arrangements that will operate until a local authority has adopted a Plan Strategy for their council area. It also retains certain existing planning policy statements (PPSs). These include PPS 3 – Access, Movement and Parking, PPS 7 – Quality Residential Environments and the Addendum to PPS 7 – Safeguarding the Character of Established Residential Areas (APPS 7) which are of relevance in the appeal. The SPPS further states that 'Creating Places – Achieving Quality in Residential Developments' will continue to be treated as a material consideration during the transitional period. The SPPS is no more prescriptive than the abovementioned retained policies and thus the retained policies take precedence in decision making in accordance with the transitional arrangements outlined in the SPPS.

6. Policy QD1 of PPS 7 states that planning permission will only be granted for new residential development where it is demonstrated that the proposal will create a quality and sustainable residential environment. The design and layout of residential development should be based on an overall design concept that draws upon the positive aspects of the character and appearance of the surrounding area. In established residential areas proposals for housing development will not be permitted where they would result in unacceptable damage to the local character, environmental quality or residential amenity of these areas. The policy sets out nine criteria that proposals for residential development will be expected to conform to. The Council raised concerns in relation to criteria (a) and (h) regarding local character and residential amenity. In addition, objectors raised concerns under criterion (f) – car parking.

7. APPS 7 provides additional planning policy provisions on the protection of local character, environmental quality and residential amenity within established residential areas. Established residential areas are defined at Annex E as residential neighbourhoods dominated by medium to low density single family housing with associated private amenity space or gardens. This part of East Belfast is dominated by medium density residential use. Although some dwellings have limited private amenity space or avail of communal amenity space, on the whole I consider it to be an established residential area. Policy LC1 of APPS 7 states that in established residential areas, planning permission will only be granted for the redevelopment of existing buildings to accommodate new housing where all the criteria set out in Policy QD 1 of PPS 7 and three additional criteria are met including that the proposed density is not significantly higher than that found in the established residential area.

8. The appeal site is located in the inner urban Sydenham area of East Belfast at the junction of Connsbrook Avenue and Brandon Parade. It encompasses a number of existing buildings. No. 72 is a two-storey building with its gable fronting onto Connsbrook Avenue. There was formerly a convenience store on the ground floor. To its rear is a single storey building which fronts onto Brandon Parade. It operated as a cash and carry fuel sales business. Nos. 74 to 78 are derelict single storey former retail units. A gateway to the north of No. 78 provides access to No. 78A to the rear. With the exception of No. 72, the existing buildings are flat roofed. The area surrounding the appeal site is in residential use. To the north is a small development of two storey semi-detached houses at Park Grange, a cul-de-sac

accessed off Park Avenue. Brandon Parade to the south and west is lined by two storey terraced and semi-detached dwellings. On the opposite (eastern) side of Connsbrook Avenue is a terrace of around 24 2½ storey dwellings. There are some examples of apartment developments of three or more storeys within 100m of the appeal site.

9. The appeal proposal is an L-shaped 2½ storey apartment block which would provide 12 units of accommodation, one of which would be suited to a wheelchair user. The main entrance would be from Connsbrook Avenue. The building would be set back slightly from the existing footways on both streets leaving small garden areas defined by metal railings for the ground floor apartments. The street elevations would be interspersed with bay windows at ground floor level. A shared amenity space, bin storage and cycle parking would be provided to the rear. The building would have a hipped roof with dormers and rooflights providing daylight to the second floor apartments. External walls visible from the surrounding streets would be finished with red brick and those facing the rear amenity space would be rendered. The sloped parts of the roof would be covered with concrete tiles.

10. The planning history of the site is a material consideration. Three smaller apartment developments have previously been approved on distinct areas of the overall site. Planning permission was granted on 15th June 2004 for a 2 storey block of four apartments fronting onto Brandon Parade on the site of the fuel sales business under application Z/2004/0230/F. On 22nd September 2008, outline planning permission was granted for a 2½ storey block of four apartments at No. 72 Connsbrook Avenue, the corner site last used as a convenience store, under application Z/2008/0870/O. On 11th November 2019, the Council granted planning permission for demolition of the commercial units at Nos. 74 – 78 Connsbrook Avenue and erection of a 2½ storey block of five apartments under application LA04/2018/2795/F. None of the above permissions were implemented and two of them are time expired, though I note that had they been implemented, the result would have been 13 apartments on the appeal site. The planning history establishes the principle of apartment development on the site. As LA04/2018/2795/F remains live and could be implemented, comparisons can be drawn between the impact of the approved development and the appeal proposal with regard to local character and residential amenity.

11. Criterion (a) of Policy QD1 requires that the development respects the surrounding context and is appropriate to the character and topography of the site in terms of layout, scale, proportions, massing and appearance of buildings, structures and landscaped and hard surfaced areas. The Council raised concerns that the layout, built form, scale and mass of the building would not be in keeping with the overall character of the area and that the proposal would result in overdevelopment of the site. They also objected to the proposed housing density.

12. The appeal site is located in an inner urban area with a fine urban grain. Dwellings are closely packed and there is a range of heights and scales of buildings, mostly of 2 or 2½ storeys. The L-shaped plan-form of the proposal enables it to front onto both adjacent streets and its active frontage is broken up by the use of bay windows, a characteristic feature of many dwellings in the area. The slight set-back from the rear of the footpaths opens up views along the respective streets and enables the provision of landscaped defensible space to the ground floor apartments. The small

front gardens mirror those found in Brandon Parade and Connsbrook Avenue. The communal amenity space to the rear of the building is generously proportioned, exceeding the standards recommended in Creating Places. A range of sizes of apartments is proposed and they are laid out to benefit from natural daylight while providing passive surveillance of two streets. A third party suggested that the dwellings are restricted to the Connsbrook Avenue side of the site, but this would leave an unsatisfactory gap in the Brandon Parade frontage and would not respect the existing pattern of development which has frontage onto both streets. The scheme responds positively to the characteristics of the site and area and the objections to its layout cannot be sustained.

13. The height and scale of the proposed building is comparable to existing and approved development in the area. The ridge height would be approximately 1.3m higher than the existing building on the site at No. 72, 0.6m higher than that of the extant approval LA04/2018/2795/F and slightly lower than that of the dwellings opposite on Connsbrook Avenue. Where it would sit adjacent to two storey development at Brandon Parade and Park Grange, its bulk and massing would be reduced by the use of a hipped roof. The development does not need to have identical dimensions to neighbouring properties to respect their character. The appellant has highlighted five other examples of larger apartment blocks built adjacent to two storey dwellings within around 100m of the site. While I have not been advised of the circumstances pertaining to the approval of each of these developments, they collectively demonstrate that such relationships between buildings are a common aspect of the character of the area and that the scale of the proposed building is not out of keeping with other nearby apartment developments.

14. Paragraph 7.10 of Creating Places indicates that blocks exceeding two storeys in height should be located to provide focal points and that such scale is more appropriate along local distributor roads and other important streets and avenues. Connsbrook Avenue is the principal thoroughfare through this part of Sydenham with smaller streets running off it. I consider a taller building an appropriate focal point on this corner site. The existing pattern of development includes development of the scale proposed along Connsbrook Avenue adjacent to two storey development on the side streets. The proposal thus respects its surrounding context.

15. The Council and appellant differed regarding calculation of the housing density of the proposal and surrounding areas. The evidence indicates that the appellant has measured the area of each block using the measurement function of Spatial NI. This rounds the measured area to one decimal point which I consider can distort the density figures for such small areas, as can the inclusion or otherwise of streets and footways. The area of the appeal site, measured from the drawings, is 0.076ha, as stated by the Council. This was rounded to 0.1ha by the appellant. Based on the exact area without rounding, the density of the proposal would be 158 dwellings per hectare (dph). The extant planning approval LA04/2018/2795/F relating to part of the appeal site would have a density of 99dph. However, had all the developments approved on the totality of the appeal site over the last 20 years been built, the overall density would have been 171 dph. The 24 dwellings in the terrace opposite the site on Connsbrook Avenue have a density of 185 dph. The eastern portion of Brandon Parade has a density of around 88 dph. There is a lower density of 62 dph at Park Grange to the north. Like many residential areas, it is evident that there is a

range of housing densities present in the local area. The appeal proposal would fall within this range, albeit towards its upper end. This is appropriate for a corner site on a main thoroughfare and would not represent overdevelopment of the site. As the proposed density is not significantly higher than that found in the established residential area, it is not contrary to Policy LC1 (a). The proposal would respect its surrounding context and is appropriate to the character of the local area as required by criterion (a) of Policy QD1. The Council's first reason for refusal and the related concerns of third parties have not been sustained.

16. Criterion (h) of Policy QD1 requires that the design and layout will not create conflict with adjacent land uses and there is no unacceptable adverse effect on existing or proposed properties in terms of overlooking, loss of light, overshadowing, noise or other disturbance. The Council's concerns relate to overlooking and dominance. Third parties have also raised loss of light and disturbance during construction.

17. Paragraph 4.38 of the Justification and Amplification to Policy QD1 states that the protection of the privacy of the occupants of residential properties is an important element of the quality of a residential environment. It is a particularly important consideration where new development is proposed adjacent to existing properties. Proposals should therefore seek to provide reasonable space between buildings in order to minimise overlooking. This will also assist in providing acceptable levels of daylight to properties. Paragraph 7.15 of Creating Places indicates that a separation distance of around 20m or greater between the opposing rear first floor windows of new houses is generally acceptable on greenfield sites and in low-density developments. The appeal site is a brownfield site and is not in a low-density area. Creating Places goes on to state that smaller separation distances are acceptable with mitigating measures to promote privacy. Paragraph 7.17 advises that a minimum distance of around 15m should be provided between the rear of apartments and the boundary with private gardens of existing properties. Nevertheless, paragraph 7.18 states that greater flexibility will generally be appropriate in assessing the separation distance for apartments in inner urban locations or other high density areas. The above guidance does not apply to gable-to-gable relationships.

18. The rear of apartments 1, 5 and 9 would be 17m from the common boundary with the rear garden of No. 7 Brandon Parade. The rear of apartments 4, 8 and 12 would be 11.7m from the common boundary with the dwellings at Park Grange with an overall separation distance between buildings of 17.8m. This is comparable to the existing separation distance between No. 7 Brandon Parade and Nos. 3 and 4 Park Grange. Given the inner urban context of the appeal site and the use of obscure glazing as a mitigating measure where indicated on the plans, I consider that the proposal provides a reasonable back-to-back space between buildings. I do not consider that the first and second floor bedroom windows in apartments 8 and 12 would give rise to unacceptable overlooking at this distance, so it is not necessary to condition that they are obscure glazed as suggested by the Council. The Council raised concerns about potential sideways views from the kitchen windows of apartments 5 and 9 towards Park Grange. These windows face onto the shared amenity space and sideways views would be rendered difficult as occupants would be further back behind kitchen units. Therefore they would not cause unacceptable overlooking of properties at Park Grange.

19. The gable of apartments 4, 8 and 12 will be 4.6m from the gable of No. 7 Brandon Parade. This exceeds the separation distance between existing buildings on Brandon Parade. Although the appeal building would be higher and deeper than No. 7, its visual impact would be diminished by the use of a hipped roof. It will not dominate views out of No. 7 as it has no windows in its gable. It would not be necessary to obscure glaze any of the windows in the gable of the appeal development as they face into the blank gable of No. 7 and not its private garden which is further north. Although there are windows in the two-storey rear return of No. 7, they are set back further from the common boundary and would look mainly towards the communal open space rather than the gable of the proposed building, only 2m of which would be visible from them. The proposal would not be unduly dominant from this property.

20. The northern gable of apartments 1, 5, and 9, which would have no windows, would face the rear of No. 7 Park Grange. The separation distance between the buildings would be 8.6m. The Council is concerned that this would result in dominance when viewed from Nos. 7 and 8. The set-back of the appeal building from the edge of Connsbrook Avenue will increase views out of and light into No. 8, negating any concerns about dominance. The gable of the extant approval LA04/2018/2795/F would come as close as 6.0m to the rear of No. 7 Park Grange. The extant approval would also have a much wider and higher gable. As the Council concluded that its impact was acceptable in 2019 and it could still be built, their concerns regarding the dominance of the appeal proposal which is narrower, lower due to the use of a hipped roof and 2.6m further away from the existing dwellings cannot be sustained.

21. Third parties raised concerns in relation to loss of light and overshadowing as a result of the proposed development. The appellant's evidence includes a Daylight and Sunlight Assessment Report by Herrington Consulting Ltd. in relation to the scheme previously approved under application LA04/2018/2795/F. The report applies the assessment criteria set out in the Building Research Establishment (BRE) publication "Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight – a Guide to Good Practice" (2011) in respect of the three properties directly north of the site (Nos. 6 to 8 Park Grange). It concludes that the development then proposed would cause some reductions to daylighting at these properties, but that these would be within the limits set out in the BRE Guidelines and would not be to an unacceptable degree. It further states that any changes to the daylight received by the habitable rooms of the neighbouring buildings will not be significant and is unlikely to be noticeable by the occupants.

22. The appellant argues that if the previously approved proposal was found acceptable with regard to light levels at neighbouring properties, the appeal proposal which is further away from these dwellings should also be acceptable. I accept that the appeal development is likely to have a lesser impact on Nos. 6 to 8 Park Grange than the previously approved proposal due to its similar overall height, more distant position and narrower gable depth. However, the Herrington Consulting Ltd. report is not of assistance in determining the impact on daylight for dwellings on Brandon Parade as the development it related to did not extend to the southern part of the appeal site. The appeal building would be sited to the east of No. 7 Brandon Parade. There are no windows in its eastern gable that would suffer from loss of light. East facing windows in its rear return are set back a further 3m and sunlight from the east would not be obstructed by the back corner of apartments 4, 8 and 12. There may

be a limited loss of light to these windows and the rear garden when the sun is in the south east (i.e. late mornings), but this effect would cease by midday. I am not persuaded that this would constitute unacceptable loss of light. The dwellings on the southern side of Brandon Parade will not suffer unacceptable loss of light given their position to the south of the appeal site and any effects on properties to the eastern side of Connsbrook Avenue would be limited to the late evening. The third parties' concerns regarding loss of light have not been sustained.

23. A third party referred to the level of disruption construction of the development would bring to the daily lives of residents. Some temporary inconvenience is often associated with construction work, but this is for a limited period and can be mitigated by the developer adhering to best practice guidelines. Furthermore, the Council has powers to investigate reasonable complaints regarding noise or other disturbance. Accordingly, any temporary disruption associated with the construction of the development would not justify the refusal of planning permission.

24. The owner of No. 7 Brandon Parade was concerned that the 3m wall between their property and the appeal site would be removed and replaced by a 1.8m fence, which would harm privacy and wildlife in her garden. I consider that a 1.8m high fence is sufficient to prevent any overlooking at ground level and no evidence that the proposal would harm specific types of wildlife was provided. Ownership of the physical party boundary would be a legal matter between the third party and the developer and the grant of planning permission for the development would not dispense with the necessity of obtaining the permission of the owners of adjacent dwellings for the removal or replacement of the existing party boundary. As none of the Council's or third parties' concerns regarding residential amenity have been sustained, the Council has not sustained its second reason for refusal.

25. Criterion (f) of Policy QD1 requires that adequate and appropriate provision is made for parking. Policy AMP7 of PPS 3 states that development proposals will be required to provide adequate provision for car parking. The precise amount of car parking will be determined according to the specific characteristics of the development and its location having regard to the Department's published standards or any reduction provided for in an area of parking restraint designated in a development plan. Proposals should not prejudice road safety or significantly inconvenience the flow of traffic.

26. No parking would be provided on site and the development would rely on on-street parking. Third parties objected to the absence of any dedicated car parking provision for the development, highlighting the high level of existing parked cars in the area. Most of the appeal site's road frontage is marked with double yellow lines. One letter stated that people drive into the area to park and get public transport into work. I observed a high level of parked cars when I visited the appeal site, but found that there were spaces available on-street and I had no difficulty in getting parked close to the site.

27. A Parking Survey Report was submitted with the application. It states that the 12 apartments would require a total of 20 parking spaces under the Department's *Parking Standards*. I agree that this is the correct baseline figure. The report goes on to set out census data for the Island Ward of Belfast within which the site is located. This reveals that 44% of households in the area do not own a car and that

48% of residents use other modes of transport for travel to work (such as walking, cycling and public transport). A Travel Plan was also provided with the application incorporating measures to encourage alternative travel modes including the provision of 10 covered cycle stands within the site, provision of a free residential travel card, subsidised membership of a car club scheme and free membership of the Belfast Bike Scheme for three years for each dwelling. The implementation of this Travel Plan can be secured by a planning condition. In light of the above considerations, it is unlikely that the development would require the full 20 car parking spaces.

28. A survey of available parking spaces within 150m of the site was undertaken both before 7.30am and after 7.30pm when most residents' cars would be parked. It found that 21 legal parking spaces were available in the morning and 26 were available in the evening. This would exceed the maximum requirement of 20 spaces for the development. In any case, I consider that the lower level of car ownership in the area and alternative travel incentives offered through the Travel Plan mean it is unlikely that 20 spaces would be required. On the basis of the submitted Parking Survey Report and my observations on site and in the absence of any objection from the Council or the road authority, I am satisfied that there is adequate provision for car parking on-street in accordance with policies QD1 (f) and AMP7. A third party suggested that part of the appeal site should be given over to car parking, but I consider that this would unacceptably impact on active frontage and amenity provision and is not necessary given the on-street parking available. Therefore, the third parties' concerns regarding parking provision have not been sustained.

29. Two objectors raised the lack of available wastewater treatment capacity to serve the development, due to Sydenham wastewater pumping station being at capacity. The Drainage Assessment submitted with the application proposes a connection to the existing combined sewer in Connsbrook Avenue. However, this would not be permitted if the receiving wastewater pumping station is at capacity. The Council suggested a condition that the development shall not be occupied until a drainage solution based on an agreed Wastewater Impact Assessment is agreed. Evidence from one of the third parties includes a letter from the then Minister for Infrastructure, Nichola Mallon MLA, which advises that in areas where capacity constraints exist, the developer may have to undertake a Wastewater Impact Assessment in order to determine what works would be required to enable the development to connect to the wastewater infrastructure. NI Water will only permit connections which will result in no detriment to the existing sewer network or customers.

30. The Appellant is of the opinion that an engineering solution for disposal of wastewater can be found. This would require the completion of a Wastewater Impact Assessment for the development. If the Council's draft condition was imposed as worded, it could allow the development to be constructed, but not occupied if no satisfactory sewerage solution could be found. This would not be in the public interest. Accordingly, I consider that the imposition of a negative planning condition is necessary. This would prohibit commencement of any development until a Wastewater Impact Assessment confirms that a sewerage connection can be made or that alternative provision for disposal of sewerage is made and this is submitted to and agreed in writing by the planning authority. This would ensure that the concerns raised by third parties in respect of sewerage capacity are properly addressed before the development can proceed.

31. It is necessary to impose a planning condition requiring that the windows marked "OG" on the plans are fitted with obscured glass and permanently retained as such to prevent unacceptable overlooking of neighbouring properties. It is necessary to require the development to operate in accordance with the submitted Travel Plan and to ensure that the cycle parking area is provided before the development is occupied in order to encourage the use of sustainable modes of transport. A condition will also require that redundant accesses to the public roads surrounding the site are closed off and the footpath reinstated. Given the previous use of part of the site as a coal yard, it is necessary to condition the steps to be taken if contamination is encountered during the development of the site including the implementation of a Remediation Strategy and Verification Report. A condition is necessary to require the final drainage design to be submitted to the planning authority for agreement in writing prior to commencement of development to ensure that there is adequate mitigation against flood risk from exceedance. Conditions will require the implementation of boundary treatments and landscaping works and their replacement if required in the interests of residential amenity.

32. As I have found that none of the Council's or objectors' concerns have been sustained and the proposal complies with the LDP, PPS 3, PPS 7 and APPS 7, the appeal is allowed, subject to the conditions set out below.

Conditions

(1) No development shall take place until there has been submitted to and approved by the Council a Wastewater Impact Assessment agreed by NI Water demonstrating that the development can be served by the public sewerage system or that alternative provision for disposal of sewerage has been made.

(2) No development shall take place until there has been submitted to and approved by the Council a final Drainage Assessment including a detailed drainage network design and a demonstration of how out of sewer flooding due to exceedance of the drainage network will be managed.

(3) If contamination is encountered during development of the site, works shall cease and the Council shall be notified immediately. Any contamination shall be fully investigated in accordance with best practice. In the event of unacceptable risks being identified, a Remediation Strategy and subsequent Verification Report shall be submitted to and approved by the Council prior to the occupation of any part of the development. If required, the Verification Report shall be completed by competent persons in accordance with best practice and must demonstrate that the remediation measures have been implemented and that the site is fit for end-use.

(4) Before any dwellings are occupied, all redundant accesses from the site to the public road shall be permanently closed off and the footpath reinstated to the satisfaction of the Department for Infrastructure.

(5) Before any dwellings are occupied, covered cycle parking shall be provided in accordance with the details shown on drawing No. 21.1045 SK.01B.

(6) The approved development shall operate in accordance with the Travel Plan by Rolston Architects dated 29th October 2021.

(7) Before any dwellings are occupied, the windows marked “OG” on drawing 21.1045-SK.03A shall be fitted with obscure glass and permanently retained. Any broken panes shall be replaced with obscure glass within 4 weeks.

(8) Before any dwellings are occupied, the boundary treatments and hard landscaping works shown on drawing Nos. 21.1045 SK.01B and 21.1045-SK.04 shall be carried out in full. In the event that any part of the boundary becomes damaged or defective, it shall be replaced in accordance with the approved details within 4 weeks.

(9) All proposed soft landscaping works indicated on drawing No. 21.1045 SK.01B shall be carried out in the first planting season after the occupation of the first dwelling. Trees or shrubs dying, removed or becoming seriously damaged within five years of being planted shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of a similar size and species unless the Council gives written consent to any variation.

(10) The development shall be begun before the expiration of five years from the date of this permission.

This decision approves the following drawings:-

Council Drawing No.	**Architect’s Drawing No.**	**Title**	**Scale**	**Received by Council**
01	21.1045 01	Site Location Plan	1:1250	20 Aug 2021
02	21.1045 fig.01	Existing Site Plan	1:200	20 Aug 2021
03B	21.1045 SK.01B	Proposed Sketch Site Plan	1:200	20 Dec 2021
04A	21.1045-SK.02B	Proposed Sketch Layout Plans and Section	1:100	20 Dec 2021
05A	21.1045-SK.03A	Proposed Sketch Elevations	1:100	20 Dec 2021
06	21.1045-SK.04	Boundary Details	1:20	20 Aug 2021
07	21.1045-SK.05	Proposed Contextual Elevations	1:100	20 Dec 2021

COMMISSIONER GARETH KERR

List of Documents

Planning Authority:-	A	Statement of Case Belfast City Council
	B	Rebuttal Statement Belfast City Council
Appellant:-	C	Statement of Case Gravis Planning
	D	Rebuttal Statement Gravis Planning
Third Parties:-	E	Statement of Case Elaine Adair
	F	Statement of Case Simon Robinson
	G	Statement of Case Alex Shaw
	H	Rebuttal Statement Alex Shaw
	I	Statement of Case Eva Timmins
	J	Rebuttal Statement Eva Timmins