Planning Appeals Commission

Appeal Decision

4th Floor
92 Ann Street
BELFAST
BT1 3HH
T: 028 9024 4710

E: info@pacni.gov.uk

Appeal Reference:	2025/A0093.
Appeal by:	Craighill Developments Ltd.
Appeal against:	The refusal of full planning permission.
Proposed Development:	Residential development consisting of 33 no. dwellings, parking, access, open space, landscaping and associated ancillary site works.
Location:	Lands within the SW portion of the former Craighill Quarry, approx. 160m east of Ballyeaston Road and approx. 20m east of Nos. 8-20 and Nos. 26-34 Craighill Park, Ballyclare.
Planning Authority:	Antrim and Newtownabbey Borough Council.
Application Reference:	LA03/2023/0581/F.
Procedure:	Informal Hearings on 23rd March 2026 and 15th May 2026.
Decision by:	Commissioner Rachel Taylor, dated 19th June 2026.

Decision

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

Preliminary Matters

2. The Council originally refused planning permission for the appeal development on the basis that it failed to deliver a local neighbourhood centre, a wider equipped children's play area and 20% open space provision in conjunction with the wider zoning. In the Council's opinion it also failed to promote biodiversity and provide sufficient digital infrastructure and sustainable energy measures, affordable housing and lifetime homes. There were also concerns that it had not been demonstrated that the proposed development would not negatively impact designated sites, priority habitats, protected species and other features of biodiversity interest. Additionally, there were design issues, and it was considered that it had not been demonstrated that the proposed development would protect and conserve archaeological remains and their settings, nor in geotechnical terms that the site was suitable for development and would not lead to adverse impact on proposed properties.

3. At the request of the Council due to the consideration of duplicated matters pertaining to the wider zoning, this appeal was conjoined and heard together with appeal 2025/A0083.

4. At the hearing on 23rd March 2026 the Appellant and Council sought a postponement of proceedings on the basis that negotiations were at a very advanced stage in respect to a Section 76 legal agreement that would address the

Council's principal concerns regarding the comprehensive development of the wider zoning as a whole and they were working to resolve the remaining refusal reasons, some of which has been dealt with in the Statement of Case. The Commission allowed this and prior to the second hearing the parties confirmed that a Section 76 agreement had been agreed.

5. The Section 76 agreement encompasses the lands associated with both this appeal (Phase 4) and appeal reference 2025/A0083 (a small portion of Phase 5 lands). The agreement also encompasses the residual lands (Phase 5), which are owned by the appellant for the remainder of the zoning and will provide the mechanism for instigating the wider zoning requirements such as public open space, equipped children's play area and local neighbourhood centre. The Council confirmed that they are responsible for providing a copy of the agreement on the Statutory Charges Register. The full details of the Section 76 are not before, nor a matter for the Commission to consider.

6. Aa a consequence of this agreement, and negotiations between parties regarding the potential use of conditions, the Council withdrew all of its reasons for refusal. Whilst the Appellant had submitted a claim for costs along with their Statement of Case (SOC), this claim was withdrawn.

7. The second hearing proceeded to explore matters relating to suggested planning conditions, as well as drawings. The appellant submitted thirteen updated house type drawings within their evidence to address matters of lifetime homes, digital infrastructure and sustainable energy as well as a landscape planting plan and a draft Construction and Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) to address concerns regarding potential water pollution during the construction phase. The drawings contain the same house types and landscaping as previously submitted and assessed, with the addition of annotations regarding lifetime homes, digital infrastructure connections, solar panel or heat pump inclusion for each house and a detailed planting schedule. The drawings and draft CEMP do not represent new matters as understood against section 59 of the Act, nor would any third party unaware of them be prejudiced by their consideration as they do not change the substance of the proposed development. The drawings numbered PAC1 – 12 are therefore admissible and replace their equivalent drawings. There was also some duplication of house type drawings and lux level drawings which parties agreed at the Hearing did not need repeated and are therefore omitted.

8. Whilst the Council's refusal reasons have been withdrawn the third-party issues remain before me for consideration.

Reasons

9. The remaining issues in this appeal are whether the proposed development would:
   - constitute overdevelopment;
   - have a detrimental impact on amenity;
   - have a negative impact on natural heritage features; and
   - increase traffic, causing pollution and prejudice to road safety.

10. Section 45(1) of the Planning Act (Northern Ireland) 2011 (the Act) requires the Commission, in dealing with an appeal, to have regard to the Local Development

Plan (LDP), so far as material to the application, and to any other material considerations. Section 6(4) of the Act states that were regard is to be had to the Local Development Plan (LDP), the determination must be made in accordance with the plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

11. The Antrim and Newtownabbey Local Development Plan 2030, Plan Strategy (PS), was adopted on 3rd July 2025. The PS sets out the strategic policy framework for the Council area. In accordance with the transitional arrangements set out in the Schedule to the Planning (Local Development Plan) Regulations (Northern Ireland) 2015 (as amended), the LDP now becomes a combination of the Departmental Development Plan (DDP) and the PS read together. In accordance with the subject legislation, any conflict between a policy contained in the DDP and those of the PS must be resolved in favour of the PS. In this appeal there is no DDP as the Department did not prepare and adopt any development plans under the Planning (Northern Ireland) 1991 Order, and the LDP therefore comprises the PS only.

12. The appeal site is located within an area covered by the draft Newtownabbey Area Plan 2005 (NAP), published in March 1993. Whilst NAP was never formally adopted, the appeal site was shown within the settlement limit,

13. The draft Belfast Metropolitan Area Plan (dBMAP) effectively replaced the NAP in 2004. In May 2017, the Court of Appeal declared the adoption of the 2014 draft Belfast Metropolitan Area Plan (dBMAP) unlawful. Nevertheless, the dBMAP 2004 remains a material consideration in certain circumstances. Within this, the appeal site is located within the zoning BE04/03 'Housing Land at Craighill Quarry'. There are fourteen key site requirements (KSR), contained within dBMAP, associated with this zoning. Whilst not explicitly expressed within a reason for refusal, two KSR's were raised by the Council as being offended. These were KSR 1, which relates to provision of a Concept Master Plan to facilitate the comprehensive development of the site and KSR 5, which requires that provision be made within the proposed development for a local neighbourhood centre to include local retail outlets and community facilities. However, matters pertaining to these have been resolved and I find that these provisions are not offended.

14. In dBMAP, the appeal site is located close to a Site of Local Nature Conservation Importance (SLNCI): Craig Hill Quarry SLNCI and Craig Hill Quarry Geodiversity Site. There was no suggestion that the appeal development would have an adverse impact on these. There are no other draft policies or zonings which are pertinent to these appeals. However, the guidance documents 'Creating Places: Achieving Quality in Residential Environments (CP), Parking Standards and Development Control Advice Note (15 (DCAN15): Vehicular Access Standards are material considerations.

15. The Strategic Planning Policy Statement for Northern Ireland 'Planning for Sustainable Development' (SPPS) is material to all decisions on individual planning applications and appeals and transitional arrangements are set out in it. On 11th December 2025, the Department for Infrastructure published the SPPS, Edition 2, which included new policy provisions on Renewable and Low Carbon Energy. The Preamble to the SPPS, Edition 2 makes clear that all other policy provisions within the former SPPS are unchanged. Paragraph 1.9 of the SPPS,

Edition 2 states that where a council adopts its PS, existing policy retained under the transitional arrangements shall cease to have effect in the district of that council. As the Council has now adopted the PS, the previously retained regional policies, such as the Planning Policy Statements, have now ceased to have effect within this council district.

16. The appeal site lies within the former Craighill Quarry site and is accessed off the Ballyeaston Road from an existing estate Road which serves Craighill Park, a residential development. The site is irregular in shape, with a steep embankment between the dwellings at Craighill Park and the site, covered in stone and partly vegetated leading down to the quarry floor. The site boundaries are largely undefined, with the water body associated with the former quarry located to the east of the site.

17. The appeal proposal includes the erection of 33 no. dwellings, parking, access, open space, landscaping and associated ancillary site works. The dwellings would comprise 11 detached and 22 semi-detached units with varying ridge heights between 8.4m and 8.8m and several differing house types creating variety with a similar architectural style and palette of materials including painted render walls, grey brick plinths, projections and bay detailing and grey roof tiles. The proposed development is accessed from the internal access road to Craighill Manor off the Ballyeaston Road and each house has its own internal parking provision of at least two spaces. Plots 1-15 form an undulating line of development which back onto existing dwellings at Craighill Park and Craighill Manor and are separated by a steep embankment including proposed retaining structures to define the rear curtilage and adapt to the change in levels. The remaining plots 16-34 are on a flatter area and arranged in smaller pockets of development.

18. Whilst third parties raised overdevelopment of the site the proposed density is in line with other approvals in the zoning and the development is of a similar character.

19. Third parties raised issues during the application process which included the disruption to existing residents during construction, as well as disturbance from the new houses when occupied. According to the evidence Best Practice will be employed by the contractor and a CEMP/CMS will be in place prior to construction by way of mitigation. With regards to noise from the appeal dwellings, there are suitable separation distances between existing and proposed units as well as intervening landscaping and boundary treatments. I note that no objections were raised by the Council's Environmental Health (EH) department. Furthermore, I have been given no cogent evidence that the normal everyday activities associated with residential use would give rise to any unacceptable adverse impact on existing dwellings that would warrant the withholding of planning permission.

20. Concerns regarding an increase in antisocial behaviour, trespassing, danger to young people jumping into deep water, lack of amenities in the surrounding area and pollution from increased traffic are not determining. In respect to views from existing properties and potential impact on utility of the rear of those properties I have been given no evidence that would justify the withholding of planning permission on that basis.

21. Concerns raised regarding existing wildlife have been assessed with a Biodiversity Checklist and Preliminary Ecological Assessment (PEA), with no issues raised from the relevant consultee beyond mitigation measures during the construction phase. The appellant indicates in the draft CEMP that they will adhere to all legislative requirements, which are outwith the appeal process. All breeding birds, their nests and eggs are legally protected under Schedule 1 of the Wildlife (Northern Ireland) Order 1985. Articles 2, 6 and 7 of the order make it an offence to: intentionally kill, injure, take or possess them, disturb them (while nesting, etc.), destroy places used for shelter or protection, or offer them for sale.

22. Under Article 6(3) of the Habitats Directive, an Appropriate Assessment (AA) is required where a plan or project is likely to have a significant effect upon a European site, either individually or in combination with other projects. Regulation 43(1) of the Conservation (Natural Habitats etc.) Regulations (Northern Ireland) 1995 (as amended) states that "a competent authority, before deciding to undertake, or give any permission or other authorisation for, a plan or project which – (a) is likely to have a significant effect on a European site in Northern Ireland (either alone or in combination with other plans or projects), and is not directly connected with or necessary to the management of the site, shall make an AA of the implications for the site in view of that site's conservation objectives."

23. Where a plan or project is likely to have a significant effect on a European Site or Ramsar Site, the decision-maker shall agree to the plan or project only after having ascertained beyond reasonable scientific doubt that it will not adversely affect the integrity of the European Site or Ramsar Site.

24. The north-eastern portion of the appeal site lies adjacent to the quarry lake. The lake is hydrologically connected to the Lough Neagh and Lough Beg SPA/Ramsar via the Six Mile Water. The 'overflow' exiting from the southern boundary of the lake is culverted and then discharges into a minor open watercourse, located c.190m south of the site. The watercourse then discharges into the Sixmilewater, located c.525m south of the site. The Sixmilewater flows in a south-westerly direction away from the site, as confirmed by the Drainage Assessment.

25. I note that within the background papers, the wider site (within which the appeal site lies) had an AA carried out by SES. They concluded, having considered the nature, scale, timing, duration and location of the project, that the proposed housing on the wider site would not have an adverse effect on the integrity of any European Site, subject to the provision of a CEMP.

26. It is also noted that the Council withdrew its reason for refusal relating to ecological impacts, but that no AA was carried out by the Council or Shared Environmental Services (SES) in respect of the appeal development. The Council had considered that the appellant had not properly addressed the potential risk of materials entering the lake during the construction phase, polluting it and having downstream effects on the SPA/Ramsar. From the evidence before me, I accept there is the possibility that such materials could enter the lake and hydrological pathway, thus a significant effect on the SPA/Ramsar cannot be screened out at this stage. It is therefore necessary that I proceed to the next stage and undertake an AA.

27. The consultation response from Northern Ireland Environment Agency (NIEA) Natural Environment Division (NED) in relation to the appeal development considered that a 10m buffer between the lakeshore, as well as details of measures to prevent pollutants entering the lake, would address this matter. NED considered that these measures could be addressed through submission of a Construction Method Statement or CEMP.

28. The draft CEMP provided by the appellant outlines how the developer will minimize environmental impacts arising, prevent pollution, and comply with legal requirements during the construction phase. It includes a 10m Construction Phase Pollution Prevention Buffer (exclusion) zone between any construction works including storage and the quarry lake edge, watercourses and drainage channels. A Preliminary Ecological Assessment (PEA) and Biodiversity Checklist (BDCL) was also submitted with the application. It included recommendations that best practice should be employed during the construction and operational phases to minimize the potential for polluted run-off or sediment to enter any adjacent watercourse and affect designated sites adjacent to the application site.

29. Having considered the nature, scale, timing, duration and location of the project, as the authority, I am satisfied that subject to the provision of such a 10m buffer and the other measures for preventing pollutants from entering the quarry lake, watercourses and drainage channels during the construction phase, the appeal development would not be likely to have a significant effect on the integrity of the Lough Neagh and Lough Beg SPA/Ramsar (either alone or in combination with other plans or projects). Based on the information provided, I am content that no reasonable scientific doubt remains in line with the Regulations outlined above. Accordingly, a final agreed CEMP would be necessary and the provision of such could be conditioned as part of any permission granted to prevent pollutants from entering the waterways.

30. Concerns were raised regarding road safety arising from the volume of additional traffic and the fact that Craighill Park will become a through road instead of a cul-de-sac. Concerns were also raised regarding the resultant pollution from the additional traffic. DfI Roads raised no objections to the appeal development, including use of the existing road network and EH raised no issues regarding air quality. In addition, I have no substantive evidence to suggest that the appeal development would prejudice road safety or give rise to a degree of pollution that would require the refusal of planning permission on that basis. These matters would not warrant rejection of the appeal development.

31. As the Council has withdrawn its reasons for refusal and the third-party concerns have not been sustained, the appeal shall succeed. The matter of conditions remains to be considered.

32. Comments received from EH and NIEA Water Management Unit during the processing of the application endorsed the use of conditions to verify that the development has been implemented in accordance with the submitted Remediation Strategy and provide further controls from any potential risks to human health from any undiscovered land contamination. This matter was not initially included within the Council's suggested draft conditions, however, in a

post-hearing submission the Council requested several conditions, having had regard to the submitted remediation strategy for the appeal development. The conditions are reasonable and necessary to protect environmental receptors and control any risk to human health arising from land contamination.

33. DfI Roads have agreed the Private Streets Determination of this appeal development and conditions are required to ensure the orderly development of the site and the road works, as well as to provide satisfactory access to each dwelling.

34. Three landscaping conditions were discussed at the second hearing. Parties are in agreement that landscaping conditions are required for the implementation of the landscaping drawing, along with timescales for completion of same. The landscaping drawing includes proposed planting both for the private garden areas associated with the dwellings and the public open space. Whilst I agree the suggested conditions requiring implementation, timescales and replacement of any damaged or dying plants are necessary to ensure a high standard of landscaping, that is not the case with the suggested condition specifying heights for vegetation in private gardens. Regardless of the Council using these conditions on other schemes, I find the suggested condition to be unnecessary as the other conditions will secure the required standard of landscaping. A Landscape Management Plan for the open space areas associated with the development has been submitted with the application and requires conditioned to ensure its implementation for the lifetime of the development.

35. There was agreement between the parties for conditions pertaining to development according with an Archaeological Programme of Works (POW), the need for a post excavation analysis and report to ensure archaeological remains within the site are identified, protected, recorded, analysed and archived. The parties however disagreed on the need for a further condition for another POW as one had already been done and accepted during the application process.

36. The appeal site contains the site of a Cold War Royal Observer Corps monitoring post (DHP 00282:000), a site of local importance. On 5th March 2024 Historic Environment Division (Historic Monuments) (HED) provided a consultation response requiring an archaeological evaluation *'to be able to identify the extent of survival of the monument within the application area and to assess whether the development is acceptable to Policy BH 2 of PPS 6 and section 6.9 of the SPPS, or whether it can be made acceptable through an appropriate site layout and archaeological mitigation strategy.*' A POW dated 29th March 2024 by Gahan and Long was submitted including the whole site area and identifying two test trenches within the area that the recorded monitoring post was anticipated. In a response dated 3rd May 2024, HED replied that they reviewed the revised archaeological POW and were content for this scheme to proceed to archaeological licensing.

37. At no time did HED suggest that the POW should be widened to the whole site for any general archaeological potential as was suggested at the hearing. From the submitted evidence the POW was limited to the site of the potential monitoring post in agreement with HED at that time, as this was the only element identified. Had HED considered that the submitted and subsequently agreed POW was lacking in any regard, further information should have been required at that time and prior to proceeding to licensing. It is acknowledged that the site is a former

quarry which has been severely blasted and minerals extracted from it. I therefore agree that the potential for archaeological remains is limited. For these reasons I am not persuaded that a condition requiring a further POW would be necessary or reasonable.

38. A condition requiring that a sewage connection to be agreed with NI Water or a package sewage treatment plant provided prior to occupation of the dwellings is necessary to ensure an adequate means of sewage disposal is provided and to ensure protection of the aquatic environment.

39. PS Policy DM25.1(f) requires the inclusion of the provision for new digital infrastructure as part of a development proposal. In order to ensure policy compliance, a pre-commencement condition is required for a plan showing the provision of service ducting throughout the site to accommodate and enable future connection to digital services.

40. Whilst drawings show retaining details associated with the steeper gradients on site, as the area was previously identified not to be developed, and stability issues were investigated elsewhere within the overall site, parties have agreed for a fuller assessment of slope stability and any recommended works to be undertaken by way of conditions. These are likely to include further details of the proposed retaining structures including walls and embankments which have also been accepted and used elsewhere in the zoning along other slopes associated with the former quarry. The conditions are necessary to ensure adequate assessment has been made in relation to slope stability and that any measures required are implemented.

Conditions

(1) A final Construction Method Statement shall be submitted to the Planning Authority at least eight weeks prior to any works commencing and agreed with the Planning Authority. This must identify all potential risks to the adjacent watercourses and designated sites and appropriate mitigation to eliminate these risks, including provision of a 10m Construction Phase Pollution Prevention Buffer (exclusion) zone between any construction works, including storage, and the quarry lake edge, watercourses and drainage channels. Appropriate areas for the storage of construction machinery, fuels/oils, refuelling areas, must be identified. The final Construction Method Statement shall also include a section on proposed mitigation measures to be implemented during construction, and the development shall be carried out in accordance with the mitigation measures, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Planning Authority.

(2) A Verification Report shall be submitted to and approved by the Planning Authority prior to occupation of any of the development hereby permitted. The report shall be based on the Remediation Strategy Report date stamped by the Planning Authority 15th August 2023 and shall describe all the remediation and monitoring works undertaken and shall demonstrate the effectiveness of the works in managing and remediating all risks posed by contamination.

(3) If during the development works, new contamination or risks are encountered which have not previously been identified, works should cease and the Planning

Authority shall be notified immediately. This new contamination shall be fully investigated in accordance with the Land Contamination: Risk Management (LCRM) guidance available at https://www.gov.uk/guidance/landcontamination-how-to-manage-the-risks. In the event of unacceptable risks being identified, a remediation strategy shall be agreed with the Planning Authority in writing and subsequently implemented and verified to its satisfaction.

(4) After completing the remediation works, if required, under Condition 3; and prior to occupation of the development, a verification report needs to be submitted in writing and agreed with Planning Authority. This report should be completed by competent persons in accordance with the Land Contamination: Risk Management (LCRM) guidance available at https://www.gov.uk/guidance/landcontamination-how-to-manage-the-risks. The verification report should present all the remediation, waste management and monitoring works undertaken and demonstrate the effectiveness of the works in managing all the risks and wastes in achieving the remedial objectives.

(5) No development shall take place until a determination has been made under Article 3 of the Private Streets (Northern Ireland) Order 1980 as amended by the Private Streets (Amendment) (Northern Ireland) Order 1992. The development shall be carried out in accordance with that determination.

(6) No dwellings shall be occupied until that part of the service road which provides access to them has been constructed to base course. The final wearing course shall be applied on the completion of the development.

(7) The approved landscaping as shown on Drawing PAC1, shall be carried out within the first planting season following the occupation of the 30th dwelling of the development hereby approved.

(8) If within a period of 5 years from the date of the planting of any tree, shrub or hedge, that tree, shrub or hedge is removed, uprooted or destroyed or dies, or becomes, in the opinion of the Planning Authority, seriously damaged or defective, another tree, shrub or hedge of the same species and size as that originally planted shall be planted at the same place, unless the Planning Authority gives its written consent to any variation.

(9) Following the implementation of the landscaping scheme, the landscaped and open space areas shall be managed and maintained for the lifetime of the development in accordance with the Landscape Management Plan (Document 04 date stamped 15th August 2023).

(10) No site works of any nature, or development shall take place other than in accordance with the approved programme of archaeological work,

(11) A programme of post excavation analysis, preparation of an archaeological report, dissemination of results and preparation of the excavation archive shall be undertaken in accordance with the programme of archaeological work. These measures shall be implemented, and a final archaeological report shall be submitted to the Planning Authority within 12 months of the completion of

archaeological site works, or as otherwise agreed in writing with the Planning Authority.

(12) No dwellings shall be occupied until either a main sewerage connection is agreed with NI Water or the development is served by a package sewage treatment plant sited at a location to be agreed with the Planning Authority. If required, drawings and specifications of the package treatment plant and arrangements for its management and maintenance, together with plans showing how the development is eventually to be connected to the public sewerage system, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Planning Authority before any development commences. No dwellings to be served by the package treatment plant shall be occupied until it has been installed as approved and is operational. The package plant shall be managed and maintained in accordance with the approved arrangements.

(13) Prior to the commencement of the development hereby approved, a site plan shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Council, to show the provision of service ducting throughout the site to accommodate and enable future connection to digital services.

(14) Prior to the commencement of the development hereby approved, an assessment report relating to the stability of the slopes on site, and any required works to secure slope stability, shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Planning Authority.

(15) Prior to occupation of any of the dwellings hereby approved, a verification report that confirms implementation of any recommended works, if required, as contained in the report required by Condition 14, shall be submitted to and agreed in writing with the Planning Authority,

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

This decision is based on the following drawings: -

Drawing No	**Title**	**Scale**	**Stamp refused (RF) or Date accepted (DA)**
01	Site Location Plan	1:5000	RF 24th Oct 25
02	Location Map Phase 4	1:2500	RF 24th Oct 25
04/6	Site Plan	1:500	RF 24th Oct 25
06/2	Street Elevations	1:200	RF 24th Oct 25
09	Type F1.3 Drawings, Plans	1:100	RF 24th Oct 25
13/1	Type H1/1 – Drawing Handed	1:100	RF 24th Oct 25
20	Proposed Chainage Layout	1:250	RF 24th Oct 25
21	Proposed Level Layout	1:250	RF 24th Oct 25
22/1	Proposed Road Long Sections	1:500 and 1:100	RF 24th Oct 25
23	Phase 4 – proposed Drainage Layout Sheet – 1 of 2	1:250	RF 24th Oct 25

24	Phase 4 - Proposed Drainage Layout Sheet 2 of 2	1:250	RF 24th Oct 25
25/2	Proposed PSD Layout	1:250	RF 24th Oct 25
26/1	Site Sections	1:250	RF 24th Oct 25
28/1	Concept Plan	1:500	RF 24th Oct 25
29	Site sections	1:250	RF 24th Oct 25
30	Horizontal Illuminance Lux	1:500	RF 24th Oct 25
31/1	Horizontal Illuminance Lux	1:500	RF 24th Oct 25
32	Horizontal Illuminance Lux	1:500	RF 24th Oct 25
35	Detached Garage	1:50	RF 24th Oct 25
36/1	Proposed Retaining Layout 1 details	As shown and 1:25	RF 24th Oct 25
37	Horizontal Illuminance Lux	1:500	RF 24th Oct 25
38	Horizontal Illuminance Lux	1:500	RF 24th Oct 25
39	Horizontal Illuminance Lux	1:500	RF 24th Oct 25
40	Horizontal Illuminance Lux	1:500	RF 24th Oct 25
41	Horizontal Illuminance Lux	1:500	RF 24th Oct 25
PAC1	Planting Plan	1:500	DA 11th Feb 26
PAC2	Type F1.3 – Drawings, Elevations	1:100	DA 11th Feb 26
PAC3	Type F1.4 - Drawings	1:100	DA 11th Feb 26
PAC4	Type G3 - Drawings	1:100	DA 11th Feb 26
PAC5	Type G3H – drawings Handed	1:100	DA 11th Feb 26
PAC6	Type H1.2 - Drawings	1:100	DA 11th Feb 26
PAC7	Type H1.3 – Drawings/Bay	1:100	DA 11th Feb 26
PAC8	Type H1.4 – Drawings/Bay Handed	1:100	DA 11th Feb 26
PAC9	Type J1.0 - Drawings	1:100	DA 11th Feb 26
PAC10	Type J1.0H – Drawings Handed	1:100	DA 11th Feb 26
PAC11	Type F1.2H - Drawings Handed Lifetime Homes	1:100	DA 11th Feb 26
PAC12	Type F1.2 – Drawings Lifetime Homes	1:100	DA 11th Feb 26

COMMISSIONER RACHEL TAYLOR

List of Appearances

Planning Authority: -	Conor Fegan (BL) Paul Casey (BL on behalf of Antrim & Newtownabbey Borough Council (ANBC) Sairead McCarthy (ANBC) Ashleigh Wilson (ANBC) Dr Thomas R Kerr - Department for Communities Historic Environment Division (HED) Johanna Voulteenaho (HED observing**) Michelle Rosplock (HED observing**) Kieran Parker (Geological Survey of Northern Ireland**)
Appellant: -	Stewart Beattie (BL) Maria O'Lone (Tughan's Solicitors) Chris Bryson (Gravis Planning) Billy Quinn (Craighill Quarries) Noel Murphy (Craighill Quarries**) Leon Smith (Formative Architects**) Adam Heaney (Taylor and Boyd Civil Engineering**) Chris Long (Gahan & Long Archaeology**) Erin Galbraith (McCloy Consulting**) David Clarke (Landscape Architect and Biodiversity**) Korina Smolka (Landscape Architect**)

Indicates attendance only at IH dated 23rd March 2026**

List of Documents

Planning Authority: -	'A'	Statement of Case – Antrim and Newtownabbey Borough Council (ANBC)
	'A1'	Rebuttal Statement - ANBC
	'A2'	Post-hearing comments re land contamination conditions (requested by Commissioner)
Appellant: -	'B'	Statement of Case – Gravis Planning
	'B1'	Rebuttal Statement – Gravis Planning
	'B2'	Post-hearing comments re land contamination conditions (requested by Commissioner)