Planning Appeals Commission

Appeal Decision

Park House
87/91 Great Victoria Street
BELFAST
BT2 7AG
T: 028 9024 4710
F: 028 9031 2536
E: info@pacni.gov.uk

Appeal Reference:	2020/A0017
Appeal by:	Clanmil Developments
Appeal against:	The refusal of full planning permission
Proposed Development:	Erection of 39 apartments (4 storey building) with rooftop amenity space, new access arrangements from Victoria Road, servicing and drop off provision, bin stores, cycle parking, landscaping and associated site works
Location:	8-10 Victoria Road, Derry
Planning Authority:	Derry City and Strabane District Council
Application Reference:	A/2014/0592/F
Procedure:	Hearing on 14th April 2021
Decision by:	Commissioner Diane O'Neill, dated 30th April 2021

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 have adequate car parking provision
   - would have an adverse impact on road safety
   - would be of an appropriate design

3. Section 45 (1) of the Planning Act (NI) 2011 requires the Commission, in dealing with an appeal, to have regard to the local development plan, so far as material to the application, and to any other material considerations. Within the Derry Area Plan 2011 (adopted May 2000), which operates as the statutory development plan for the area, the appeal site is located within the commercial core (Proposal CA 2) of the designated central area (Proposal CA 1) as well as within a flat policy area (Policy H5).

4. The Strategic Planning Policy Statement for Northern Ireland (SPPS) sets out the transitional arrangements that will operate until a local authority has adopted a Plan Strategy for the whole of the council area. The SPPS retains certain existing planning policy documents and amongst these are Planning Policy Statement 3: Access, Movement and Parking (PPS 3) and Planning Policy Statement 7: Quality Residential Environments (PPS 7).

5. The appeal site is located off and substantially below the level of Victoria Road along the bank of the River Foyle in close proximity to the listed Craigavon Bridge.

There is a stone wall and mature vegetation located along the Victoria Road boundary. The site contains a former ice house as well as an associated slipway both of which are listed. To the south of the appeal site, on the other side of Victoria Road, is Victoria Park which is a residential area of detached and semi-detached dwellings set within mature vegetated plots; it is designated as an Area of Townscape Character (ATC) within DAP. To the north-east of the site is Bassetts bathroom showroom which is accommodated within a substantial red and brown brick building. The appeal site is relatively close to Spencer Road which contains a mix of retail, office and residential uses.

6. Planning permission had previously been granted on the appeal site for residential apartments on 24th July 2000 (A/1999/0655/O); this has since lapsed. An appeal (2007/A1011) in relation to an apartment development, generally 6 storey in height with a 13 storey tower, containing 106 units, 198 car parking spaces and renovating existing structures to create a bar and restaurant, was dismissed on the site.

7. At the council's planning committee meeting on 4th March 2020 a planning official presented the appeal proposal and the accompanying minutes of the meeting state that the details of the scheme had been previously circulated to the members. An overview of the application was provided with the planning official presenting an opinion to approve the appeal proposal subject to the imposition of a number of conditions. Mr Hugh Hegarty was granted speaking rights at the meeting; from the transcript and minutes of the meeting it is evident that he outlined his reasons for the council to object to the approval of the proposal. His concerns included the inappropriateness of the proposed design of the scheme, parking and road safety matters. The appellant's agent outlined the reasons for the council supporting the approval of the application. The transcript and the minutes reflect that the members sought clarification from the representatives. The discussion in relation to the proposed development lasted for approximately 1 ½ hours with committee members raising concerns which included the need for parking for residents who have or may experience a disability in the future. The appropriateness of the design in terms of the form, finish and layout of the building given its prominent riverfront location and close proximity to the listed Craigavon Bridge and the Victoria Park ATC was also discussed.

8. The Protocol for Operation of Planning Committee (Revision 4) December 2019 states that it is the prerogative of the Planning Committee to come to its conclusions and decision provided they are backed by sound, clear and logical planning reasons following an informed debate. It is stated within the protocol that the Planning Committee can accept or give different weight to the various arguments and material considerations. Despite the officials highlighting the merits of the scheme and the planning history of the site, the members considered that the proposal was contrary to PPS 3 and PPS 7. There appears to be no requirement for the Planning Officer's report to reflect the position of the Planning Committee and the planning officials attended the planning appeal to defend the Council's final position on the case. In this case the council appear to have adhered to their protocol and having been alerted to all the relevant planning policies and the importance of Section 6(4) of the Planning Act, which requires that, where in making any determination, the determination must be made in accordance with the plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise, they were entitled to weigh the various material considerations differently, having had a

lengthy and informed debate, reaching their own decision on the proposal. The decision adequately identified for the appellant the council's reasons for refusing the proposal and their relevant basis within planning policy.

9. The council's first reason for refusal related to Policies AMP 1 and AMP 7 of PPS 3 in that the development does not provide an accessible environment for everyone and adequate car parking for the development has not been provided. Policy AMP 1 of PPS 3, which relates to creating an accessible environment, states that developers should take account of the specific needs of people with disabilities and others whose mobility is impaired in the design of new development. *Where appropriate* (my emphasis), the external layout of development will be required to incorporate *all or some* (my emphasis) of the following: facilities to aid accessibility together with the removal of any unnecessary obstructions; convenient movement along pathways and an unhindered approach to buildings; pedestrian priority to facilitate pedestrian movement within and between land uses; and ease of access to reserved car parking, public transport facilities and taxi ranks. Policy AMP 7, which deals with car parking and servicing arrangements, states that development proposals will be required to provide adequate provision for car parking and appropriate servicing arrangements. The precise amount of car parking is said to be determined according to the specific characteristics of the development and its location having regard to the published standards or any reduction provided for in an area of parking restraint designated in a development plan. In assessing car parking provision, it is stated that it will be required that a *proportion of the spaces to be provided* (my emphasis) are reserved for people with disabilities in accordance with best practice. Where a reduced level of car parking provision is applied or accepted, this will not normally apply to the number of reserved spaces to be provided.

10. The appeal proposal has to be assessed as it is now presented. Policy TR 5 within the DAP states that car parking provision in new developments will be controlled on a zonal basis. Within Zone A the Commercial Core, where the appeal site is located, only operational car parking (servicing and other essential operations) will normally be permitted. No distinction is made to where a site is located within Zone A. Paragraph 14.10 adds that in Zone A, parking provision for service vehicles and other essential operations only will be permitted with a view to keeping the main shopping area as free as possible from vehicular traffic. The current provision was expected to meet the parking requirements for most of the Commercial Core.

11. As reflected by its designation within DAP, the appeal site is located within a highly accessible location within walking distance of public transport (bus stops and bus/rail stations) as well as local amenities and businesses. The appellant's Framework Travel Plan, which includes the appointment of a Travel Plan Coordinator, sets out the long-term strategy to maximise the opportunity for the proposed residents to avail of sustainable travel modes and minimise travel to the development by the private car. The appellant would inform potential residents prior to signing a contract for the accommodation that on site car parking is unavailable for them and their visitors. Should a resident fail to declare the need for car parking, the appellant stated that their application would be void as they had not been honest and upfront in relation to their needs. A variety of areas were identified within this locality which would offer short-term pay and display

parking during the daytime or free evening or Sunday parking for the proposed residents' visitors who would travel here via private transport. Those parking within the area would be at no greater risk than any other member of the public when negotiating the road crossings. Should parking occur along Victoria Road then this would be a matter for the relevant authorities. Given that the objectors stated that Victoria Park is not adopted by DfI Roads, it would be for its residents to address any existing or future parking issues within the development. I am therefore not persuaded by the unsubstantiated assertions that the development would cause or contribute to any existing parking issue within the area. Although DfI Roads stated during the processing of the planning application that 2-3 car parking spaces may be required in addition to the operational parking number of spaces, they did not raise any objection to the proposal and the appellant was not requested by the council to provide such spaces.

12. In terms of the objection to there not being an element of on-site parking provision for social housing residents who are experiencing a disability or may do so in the future, the Northern Ireland Housing Executive (NIHE) are the strategic regional housing authority for Northern Ireland and are responsible for the identification and analysis of housing need. NIHE have identified a need for 318 housing units within this Waterside 1 Housing Area over the period 2020-25. Given the composition of household groups on the waiting list and the proportion of allocations, NIHE identified a housing need at the appeal site for 39 3 person 2-bedroom apartments in order to provide accommodation for occupants who are classified as being of General Needs and do not require a wheelchair. General Needs housing is defined by the Department for Communities as general family housing and dwellings for singles and couples. Any applicant with specific complex needs or specialised wheelchair adaption requirements is allocated through a separate specific designated applicant's referral process. The appellant however stated that a person experiencing a disability would not be prevented from living in the development and should a resident require care services or transportation by private transport, there is adequate space in order to drop-off/pick-up occupants.

13. It is understandable that the General Needs allocation system can only account for people's current needs. It would be impossible to plan for all eventualities as needs can change similarly to when a growing family may require larger accommodation or residents may wish to downsize. The NIHE allocations process however facilitates transfer to other accommodation, including to that managed by other housing associations, should people's requirements significantly change and they wish to move at a later stage. The appellant also identified that there is no requirement within social housing legislation for a social housing development to provide any parking provision and that there are a number of similar developments across Northern Ireland which operate successfully without such provision.

14. The appellant stated that there are many social housing General Needs developments within Derry which do not have any parking provision. Eight schemes were identified by the appellant which were granted planning permission either by the former Department of the Environment or more recently by the council. Although two of the examples had a previous use which either had no available parking or there would be an element of parking gain as it would require less parking than the previous night-club use, the council only identified one of the eight schemes as having some designated parking spaces. Where the details

were available to the council, the other schemes were identified as being in proximity to general public parking facilities. The council has therefore not required on-site reserved car parking facilities for residents and carers for the majority of other identified social housing developments within the city. The appellant also highlighted that one of the identified schemes contained a wheelchair access unit however the council confirmed at the hearing that no reserved car parking was provided or sought for that development. Although the previous planning permission on the appeal site for residential development (A/1999/0655/O) required 1.5 car parking spaces per apartment, this was only granted planning approval in principle with no number of apartments specified and it has since lapsed with no substantive details of the case available given the passage of time.

15. Given that the statutory development plan for the area identifies the appeal site within an area of parking restraint where only operational car parking will normally be permitted, the highly accessible nature of the location, that the development is to provide much needed General Needs housing, that the external layout of the development aids its accessibility to all, that people with a disability would not be prevented from applying to be accommodated within this development if they so wished and that other schemes have been granted planning approval without the need for onsite parking, I consider that car parking is not required in this instance in order to make it accessible to everyone. Accordingly, the first reason for refusal and the objectors concerns in relation to this matter are not sustained.

16. The second reason for refusal stated that the proposal was contrary to criterion (g) of Policy QD 1 in PPS 7 in that the design of the development does not draw upon the best local traditions of form, materials and detailing. In choosing its regimented design, with vertical emphasis in its repetitive window openings, I accept that the appellant has sought to reflect the industrial heritage of the city as opposed to that of the appeal site per se. The appeal site is located in a prominent location along the frontage of the River Foyle in close proximity to the considerable Craigavon Bridge and adjacent to Bassetts sizable showroom. It is located at a much lower level than Victoria Road. When viewed from the identified critical viewpoints, it is apparent that the site benefits from a substantial vegetated backdrop with the landform on the opposite of Victoria Road rising steeply towards the Strabane Old Road. The highly attractive Victoria Park properties, which contains one listed building, are located and dispersed within this vegetated hillside setting. Given the substantial nature of this backdrop, the scale of the neighbouring showroom building together with the Craigavon Bridge, I consider that this brownfield appeal site, which is of limited depth and within an area the council considers suitable for apartment development, could satisfactorily accommodate the appeal proposal. From Victoria Road, the development would be set back from the road by approximately 22m with only the upper section visible given that the appeal site is located approximately 12m below the level of the road. Given the lower level of the appeal site, which is separated from the elevated properties within Victoria Park, it would not adversely impact on the character of the ATC nor of its surrounding area. Historic Environment Division also raised no objection to the proposal. There are numerous examples of the use of varying colours of brick within the wider locality and at the hearing the council accepted that this would be acceptable subject to them agreeing the type of brick prior to the commencement of development on the site.

17. It would be the bedroom areas within some of the apartments which would be in closest proximity to the access ramp with the living areas either being dual aspect or being further away from the access. These apartments would also be facing south-east so would have the most sunlight, are sufficiently removed from Victoria Road's retaining wall and their outlook would of the proposed intervening landscaped area the completion, management and maintenance of which can be ensured by condition. No substantive evidence was presented to dispute the appellant's assertion that all the apartments met the appropriate threshold level of lighting. It would only be apparent from an internal inspection of the building that the units are all two-bedroom and have a similar layout however this meets the identified housing need, makes best use of the available space to provide suitable social housing accommodation within this relatively restricted site whilst permitting as many views as possible of its attractive riverfront setting. At present, access is not available along the river frontage of the appeal site, with the walkway terminating at its boundary. However, the appellant has engaged with the Sustrans charity and ensured that the appeal proposal would provide for the potential future greenway connection to the Craigavon Bridge along its river frontage. In terms of the lack of residential access to the river walk from the rear of the building, it is understandable that the appellant would want to control public access to the building thus preventing people gaining entry from the riverside elevation. They would still have access via the main communal entrance. Accordingly, the second reason for refusal and the objectors concerns in relation to this matter are not sustained.

18. Objectors raised concern that the development would have an adverse impact on road safety at this location. As only one vehicle could be on the internal access road at a time due to its restricted width, a barrier system would be in operation within the appeal site with one barrier close to its entrance and the other at the internal turning area. The default position of the entrance barrier would be to be open, however if this was closed due to a vehicle being located within the site, there would a sufficiently wide approximately 10m long area at the entrance clear of the carriageway for two cars or one large vehicle to wait safely until the vehicle exited the site. At the hearing the appellant stated that this distance could be increased to approximately 15m, if need be. With the aid of a Service Management Plan and a Framework Travel Plan, the appellant stated at the hearing that they would control the movement of traffic within the site including the operation of the barrier system which could be adjusted if need be once the scheme was operational. A Domestic Operator would be appointed by the appellant in order to oversee the daytime (Monday to Friday from 9am-5pm) management of traffic at the site. There would also be 24hr assistance in place should the system malfunction and assistance be needed. Large vehicles servicing the building, such as refuse lorries, would be scheduled for varying or off-peak times by the appellant with such arrangements set out in the appellant's Service Management Plan. It was forecast by the appellant that there would be only approximately 2-3 vehicles arriving at the site during the peak hours. No substantive details were presented to support the claim that emergency vehicles could not be accommodated within the appeal site. The appellant's Service Management Plan demonstrated that large vehicles can safely enter and manoeuvre within the site. Residents and visitors would not be permitted to park within the site.

19. Whilst the objectors stated that there has been a significant general increase in online shopping, the details of this were not provided in terms of, for example, the demographics of the sales etc. Using the latest TRICS database the appellant demonstrated that the proposal could deal with the anticipated generated traffic to and from the site. The appellant calculated that there would be a 0.3% impact on Victoria Road. No substantive evidence was presented to support the claim that the appellant's data is outdated. The access would be upgraded to provide the necessary improved visibility splays facilitating safe access onto this busy section of the Victoria Road and this could be secured by condition. There is sufficient space within the site in order for vehicles to wait without adversely impacting on the free movement of traffic at this locality. The footpath along the appeal site's road frontage onto Victoria Road is of a sufficient width to ensure the safe movement of pedestrians along this stretch of the road. Like when crossing any entrance, pedestrians would have to engage due care when negotiating the access point however this is not an issue particular to this proposal and pedestrians entering and exiting the site would be separated from the vehicular traffic. Similar to any development, it would be unsafe for children to be unsupervised where there are moving vehicles. A safe pedestrian route would however be available through the site. Cyclists and walkers using this location to connect to the river walkway would be prevented from doing so during the construction period however this would be temporary and is unavoidable. A segregated pedestrian access to the riverside walkway from Victoria Road would be provided as part of the proposal. Subject to the imposition of a number of planning conditions, DfI Roads also raised no objection to the proposal and the owner of the neighbouring showroom development expressed their support for the proposal. These concerns are therefore not sustained.

20. In terms of the other concerns raised by the objectors, the separation distance between the proposal and the Victoria Park properties together with the difference in ground levels would ensure that the development would not have an adverse impact on the residential amenity of the existing residents or result in overshadowing. A Piling Risk Assessment and a Construction Noise and Vibration Report were submitted by the appellant and these concluded that there would not be a significant noise impact on the nearest sensitive receptors and that there would be no structural damage or risk of subsidence in the immediate area at the predicted vibration levels. The council confirmed at the appeal that there was no evidence of subsidence at the appeal site. In order to complete the development within a reasonable timescale and given the intervening distance and its location along a busy key transport corridor, it is not accepted that it is necessary to reduce the standard hours of construction on the site as proposed by the council in order to protect the residential amenity of the residents of Victoria Park. The previous appeal on the site (2007/A1011) related to a different proposal and is therefore not comparable. No substantive evidence was presented that the proposal would diminish the value of the Victoria Park properties or would give rise to an increase in anti-social behaviour in the area.

21. The development is to provide residential accommodation to those who are defined as requiring General Needs Housing and it is for the appellant to determine whether this riverside location is suitable for those that apply. There would be adequate open space provision within the development and no objection to this element of the scheme was raised by the council. The residents' bins would be emptied within the site without them having to be moved to the entrance

thus preventing them posing a road safety hazard or adversely impacting on visual amenity. As the development would be located in proximity to Victoria Road, it could be conditioned that appropriate acoustic measures are incorporated into the proposal to achieve a suitable internal noise environment. Subject to a number of planning conditions, Environmental Health raised no objection to the proposal. NI Water confirmed that a public sewer was located within 20m of the appeal site in order to serve the proposal with sufficient capacity available at the receiving Waste Water Treatment Works. It could be conditioned that a Construction Environmental Management Plan, which broadly conforms with the final drainage assessment, flood risk assessment, invasive species survey and piling risk assessment, and a finalised site drainage plan be submitted to the council prior to the commencement of works on the site thus preventing pollution and protecting environmental receptors. This would ensure that there would be no direct discharge of untreated surface water run-off into the River Foyle, at least a 10m buffer is maintained between it and the construction/storage area and that protective fencing is erected and maintained along the watercourse boundary during the construction period. The Invasive Species Management Plan recommended mitigation measures which would address the Japanese Knotweed present on the site. Due to the sighting of otters on the site's slipway, the appellant was content that a planning condition be imposed requiring that an otter survey be carried out prior to commencing works in order to ensure that there would no adverse impact on the mammal. Some vegetation would be removed from the site however this is of low quality and an extensive landscaping scheme would be carried out as part of the proposal. No substantive evidence was presented that the proposal would have an adverse impact on birds of prey or that there is a significant rodent issue at this location.

22. As the reasons for refusal and the objectors concerns have not been sustained, the appeal succeeds.

23. As the Generic Quantitative Risk Assessment identified pollutant linkages at the site that have the potential to cause a risk to future users of the site, construction workers and/or environmental receptors, it is appropriate that the necessary remedial works are carried out and this can be ensured by the imposition of a planning condition.

Conditions

(1) The access, including the visibility splays, shown on the approved Drawing 13 Revision 4 date stamped received by the council on 2nd March 2020 shall be laid out before any building operations commence and shall be permanently retained.
(2) The landscaping scheme, as indicated in Drawing 17 Revision 1 date stamped received by the council on 12th December 2019, shall be carried out during the first planting season after the commencement of the development. 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.
(3) The communal open space and amenity areas shall be managed and maintained in accordance with the Landscape Management and Maintenance Plan date stamped received by the council on 20th January 2020. Any changes or alterations to the approved landscape management arrangements shall be submitted to and agreed in writing with the council.

(4) Prior to the occupation of the development, the boundary treatments identified in Drawing 24 date stamped received by the council on 20th January 2020 shall be erected along the identified boundaries of the site. The walls and railing shall be permanently retained.

(5) Prior to the occupation of the development, a Service Management Plan shall be submitted to and agreed in writing with the council. The Service Management Plan shall be in broad conformity with the Service Management Plan date stamped received by the council on 4th December 2019.

(6) Prior to occupation of the development, the final Technical Approval of the proposed structures within proximity of the road boundary shall be submitted to the council.

(7) No construction works shall take place outside of 07:00-19:00 Monday to Friday, 07:00-13:00 on Saturdays and at no time on Sundays. Piling operations shall be restricted to between 08:00-18:00 Monday to Friday, 08:00-13:00 on Saturdays and at no time on Sundays.

(8) A Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) and finalised Site Drainage Plan must be submitted to the council at least 8 weeks prior to the commencement of works on site. The CEMP should identify all potential risks and pollution pathways, demonstrate adherence to good working practices and detail all mitigation measures to be employed broadly in conformity with those outlined within the Drainage Assessment (April 2015), Flood Risk Assessment (December 2014), Invasive Species Survey (Summer 2017) and Piling Risk Assessment (August 2017). The CEMP should ensure that there would be no direct discharge of untreated surface water run-off into the River Foyle, at least a 10m buffer is maintained between it and the construction/storage area and that protective fencing is erected and maintained along the watercourse boundary during the construction period.

(9) The development shall not be occupied until the remediation measures in the WYG Environment Preliminary and Generic Quantitative Risk Assessment (July 2015) have been implemented in accordance with the agreed terms. After completing all remediation works and prior to the occupation of the development, a verification report, completed by a competent person, shall be submitted in writing and agreed with the council. Should any new contamination or risks be encountered during the construction period, works should cease, the council notified immediately and the new contamination fully investigated. A report shall be prepared and pre-agreed in writing with the council prior to works recommencing.

(10) No development shall commence until an otter survey is carried out by a suitably experienced surveyor and submitted to the council. This survey should identify any diagnostic signs relating to the presence of otters.

(11) The building shall be constructed so as to achieve an internal noise environment that does not:

- exceed 35dB LAeq (1 hour) at any time between 07:00 and 23:00 within any habitable room with the windows shut and other means of ventilation provided in accordance with current building control requirements
- exceed 30dB LAeq at all other times measured over a 5 minute period within any proposed bedroom with the windows shut and other means of ventilation provided in accordance with current building control requirements
- Exceed 45dB LAmax for any single sound event between 23:00 and 07:00 within any proposed bedroom with the windows shut and other means of ventilation provided in accordance with current building control requirements

(12) No building operations shall take place until the sample and specification of the brick finish has been submitted to and approved by the council.
(13) The development shall be begun before the expiration of five years from the date of this permission.

This decision is based on the following drawings:-

- Drawing 02 site location map date stamped received by the council on 1st December 2014
- Drawing 04 Revision 6 1:200 proposed site plan date stamped received by the council on 20th January 2020
- Drawing 07 Revision 4 1:200 proposed basement plan date stamped received by the council on 4th December 2019
- Drawing 08 Revision 3 1:200 proposed roof plan date stamped received by the council on 4th December 2019
- Drawing 09 Revision 3 1:200 proposed sections date stamped received by the council on 20th January 2020
- Drawing 10 Revision 4 1:200 proposed north and south elevations date stamped received by the council on 20th January 2020
- Drawing 11 Revision 5 1:200 proposed east and west elevations date stamped received by the council on 20th January 2020
- Drawing 13 Revision 4 1:250 private streets determination date stamped received by the council on 2nd March 2020
- Drawing 17 Revision 1 1:200 landscape layout date stamped received by the council on 12th December 2019
- Drawing 19 1:10 plan details 1 date stamped received by the council on 4th December 2019
- Drawing 20 1:200 proposed 4th floor plan date stamped received by the council on 4th December 2019
- Drawing 21 1:200 proposed 3rd floor plan date stamped received by the council on 4th December 2019
- Drawing 22 1:200 proposed 1st and 2nd floor plan date stamped received by the council on 4th December 2019
- Drawing 23 1:200 proposed ground floor plan date stamped received by the council on 4th December 2019
- Drawing 24 1:200 boundary details plan date stamped received by the council on 20th January 2020
- Drawing 25 1:50 proposed bin store date stamped received by the council on 20th January 2020
- Drawing 26 Section C-C date stamped received by the council on 20th January 2020
- Drawing 27 1:250 lighting plan date stamped received by the council on 20th January 2020

COMMISSIONER DIANE O'NEILL

List of Appearances

Planning Authority (Derry City and Strabane District Council):-	Mr James Duffy Ms Andree McNee Ms Sarah Barrett
Appellant:-	Mr Stewart Beattie QC Mr Peter Donegan (Clanmil) Mr Greg Woods (Clanmil) Mr Sam McKee (Turley) Mr Philip Stinson (Turley) Mr Sean Foy (Atkins) Mr Roy Murtagh (Atkins) Mr Harry McConnell (RPP Architects)
Third Party objectors:-	Mr Hugh Hegarty (Victoria Park) Mr John McGregor (Victoria Park)

List of Documents

Planning Authority (Derry City and Strabane District Council):-	Statement of Case PA 1 Rebuttal PA 2 Post-hearing transcript of planning committee meeting and protocol PA 3
Appellant (Turley-agent):-	Statement of Case A 1 Rebuttal A 2
Third Party Objectors (Residents of Victoria Park)	Statement of Case OB 1