Dear Sir/Madam

You are hereby invited to attend a meeting of the Ards and North Down Borough Council which will be held in the Council Chamber, Town Hall, The Castle, Bangor on Wednesday, 24 April 2019 commencing at 7.00pm.

Yours faithfully

Stephen Reid
Chief Executive
Ards and North Down Borough Council

A G E N D A

1. Prayer
2. Apologies
3. Declarations of Interest
4. Mayor’s Business
5. Mayor and Deputy Mayor Engagements for the Month (To be tabled)
6. Minutes of Meeting of Council dated 27 March 2019 (Copy attached)
7. Minutes of Committees
   7.1. Special Planning Committee dated 21 March 2019 (Copy attached)
   7.2. Audit Committee dated 25 March 2019 (Copy attached)
   7.3. Planning Committee dated 2 April 2019 (Copy attached)
8. Consultation Documents
   8.1 Department for Communities – The Sale and Supply of Alcoholic Drinks at ‘Special Events’ in Northern Ireland – Responses to be submitted no later than Friday 3 May 2019 (Copy correspondence attached)
   8.2. Department of Health – Future of Stroke Care Services in Northern Ireland – Responses to be submitted no later than 18 June 2019 (Correspondence attached)
9. Conferences and Invitations

9.1. ABF The Soldiers’ Charity – D-Day Commemoration Concert 8 June 2019 (Correspondence attached)

10. Ards and North Down Sports Forum Grants (Report attached)

11. In Bloom Funding 2019 (Report attached)


13. Community Festival Funding 2019-2020 (Report attached)

14. Veterans’ Day and Proposal to mark 75th Anniversary of D-Day Landings (Report attached)

15. Request from WSC Consulting on behalf of Crawfordsburn Construction Limited for a wayleave to connect to the watercourse in Council land at Glen Park, Crawfordsburn (Report attached)

16. Request from NIE for a wayleave at Abbey Road playing field Millisle (Report attached)

17. Rural Development Programme Co-Operation Scheme – Grey Point Fort (Report attached)

17a. Commitment to Funding of LEADER Programmes following the United Kingdom’s withdrawal from the European Union (Report attached)

18. Change of Date of Bangor and Newtownards Christmas Switch On (Report attached)

19. Proposed Street Naming – Montgomery Meadows, Donaghadee (Report attached)

20. Grant of Entertainment Licences (Report attached)

21. Request by Portavogie Coastal Rowing Club to install cargo container at Anchor Park and carry out works to install gate at old slip way (Report attached)

22. Sealing Documents

23. Transfer of Rights of Burial

24. Notice of Motion Status Report (Report attached)
24.1. Notice of Motion

24.1.1. Notice of Motion submitted by Councillor T Smith and Councillor Brooks

That this Council will bring back a report examining each Recycling Centre and ways to ensure safe pedestrian access for each site.

25. Response to Notice of Motion about Car Parking at Bangor West, Carnalea and Helens Bay Railway Stations (Report attached)

26. Response to Notice of Motion regarding Water Charges on Community Houses (Report attached)

26.1. Response to Notice of Motion re Problem Gambling and Fixed Odds Betting Terminals (Report attached)

***IN CONFIDENCE***

27. Request to Transfer Land at Upper Crescent, Comber to Northern Ireland Water (Report attached)

28. Queens Parade – Update (Copy to follow)

29. Amendment to Boundary Lines for Lease to Urban Property Solutions Ltd for the Old Donaghadee Community Centre (Report attached)

Circulated for Information

(a) Department for Infrastructure – Disabled Persons Parking Place (Correspondence attached)
(b) NISRA 2021 Census in Northern Ireland – Proposal Document (Correspondence attached)
(c) Department for Communities – Affordable Warmth Scheme (Correspondence attached)
(d) Northern Ireland Office – Northern Ireland Policing Board (Correspondence attached)
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ARDS AND NORTH DOWN BOROUGH COUNCIL

A meeting of the Ards and North Down Borough Council was held in the Town Hall, The Castle, Bangor on Wednesday, 27 March 2019 commencing at 7.00pm.

PRESENT:

In the Chair: The Mayor (Councillor Smart)

Aldermen:
Carson Henry
Fletcher Irvine
Gibson Keery
Girvan McDowell
Graham Smith

Councillors:
Adair Kennedy
Allen McAlpine
Armstrong-Cotter McClean
Brooks McKee
Cathcart McIlveen
Chambers Menagh
Cooper Muir
Cummings Robinson
Douglas Smith
Dunlop Thompson
Dunne Woods
Gilmour

Officers: Chief Executive (S Reid), Director of Organisational Development and Administration (W Swanston), Director of Community and Wellbeing (G Bannister), Director of Finance and Performance (S Christie), Director of Environment (D Lindsay), Director of Regeneration, Development and Planning (S McCullough), Corporate Communications Manager (C Jackson), Democratic Services Manager (J Wilson) and Democratic Services Officer (H Loebnau)

1. PRAYER
The Mayor (Councillor Smart) commenced the meeting by inviting the Chief Executive to open in prayer.

2. APOLOGIES
Apologies for inability to attend were received from Councillors Boyle, Edmund, Martin, Walker and Wilson. Apologies for lateness were received from Councillor Douglas.

NOTED.
3. **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

The Mayor asked for any Declarations of Interest.

Councillor Dunlop declared an interest in Item 7.5 – Community and Wellbeing Committee.

Councillors Cathcart and Alderman Gibson declared an interest in Item 24 – Tender Report – Bring Site Service Contracts.

**NOTED.**

4. **MAYOR’S BUSINESS AND**

5. **MAYOR AND DEPUTY MAYOR ENGAGEMENTS FOR THE MONTH**

(Appendix I)

PREVIOUSLY CIRCULATED:– Copy of the Mayor’s engagements for the month of March.

The Mayor outlined business for the previous month. Officers and Members had been saddened to hear of the passing of the Director of Community and Wellbeing’s mother. The Mayor had passed on the condolences of the Council and was pleased to see that the Director was present at the meeting.

He outlined the engagements for the month and expressed his gratitude to the Deputy Mayor who had assisted him.

RESOLVED, on the proposal of Alderman Gibson, seconded by Councillor Cummings, that the information be noted.

6. **MINUTES OF MEETING OF COUNCIL DATED 27 FEBRUARY 2019**

PREVIOUSLY CIRCULATED:– Copy of the above minutes.

RESOLVED, on the proposal of Alderman Gibson, seconded by Councillor Robinson, that the minutes be agreed as a correct record.

7. **MINUTES OF COMMITTEES**

7.1. **Planning Committee dated 5 March 2019**

PREVIOUSLY CIRCULATED:– Copy of the above minutes.

Councillor Cathcart asked for a correction to be made to the minutes. On page 2 it had been noted that Councillor Walker declared an interest in Item 5 and that should be changed to Councillor McKee.
RESOLVED, on the proposal of Councillor Cathcart, seconded by Alderman McDowell, that the minutes be adopted subject to the above amendment.

7.2. **Environment Committee dated 5 March 2019**

PREVIOUSLY CIRCULATED:- Copy of the above minutes.

Councillor Chambers commented on Item 6 relating to the donation of a lifebelt to the Council which was to be placed at Groomsport Harbour. He thanked the Environment Committee for the support it had given to the proposal. The Ulster Unionist Party had been approached in respect of a suitable memorial and after a conversation it was considered appropriate to donate a lifebelt and plaque. That memorial was a very fitting tribute to the life of a man who had a lifelong association of life saving.

Alderman Irvine referred to Item 20 - HRC Optimisation, querying if there had recently been a change of policy at those sites. The Director explained that there had recently been an incident at one of the smaller sites where an accident had been narrowly avoided. After taking advice from the Health and Safety officer within the Council it was viewed that vehicles and pedestrians sharing an access was an unacceptable health and safety risk. As a result of that it was suggested that unless a separate access point was available for pedestrians it would be safer for them not to enter the Household Recycling Centres on foot. Along with that residents were being encouraged to make full use of their wheeled bins which Council had made available.

Councillor Adair was aware that in his own town many people did walk to the HRC with small items such as unwanted electrical items. He strongly believed that they should continue to be able to do so. Alderman Irvine and Councillor Dunne were in agreement adding that measures should be taken, particularly in town centres to permit people to continue to recycle at those places. Officers were urged to review the position.

(Alderman Keery entered the meeting at 7.11pm)

The Director confirmed that the situation was under an ongoing review but stressed that it was crucial that the Council took health and safety extremely seriously and if it did not take on board the advice already given it would leave itself in a very exposed position should an accident occur. However, he agreed to take on board the Members comments in relation to the issue.

He added that the position that Ards and North Down was taking compared favourably with other Councils. He referred to the Holywood site where traffic and pedestrians could be segregated safely and therefore that site could continue to operate as it had done before.

Alderman Graham wondered if a solution could be reached at locations where pedestrians were now being prevented from entering such as locating a suitable
smaller container outside the entrance to a site for carried goods brought by pedestrians.

Councillor Brooks concurred with what had been said and pointed to Donaghadee where local people believed that the Council was deterring them from recycling. He reported that many people did not own cars and he considered there were other areas such as the car park at the Town Hall, Bangor where cars, vans and pedestrians moved around together.

Councillor Smith proposed that the Council review the current decision so that the loss of service could be avoided, and that proposal was seconded by Councillor Brooks.

The Chief Executive advised that a proposal could not be made in that way as the matter was not on the Council agenda and suggested that the Member might wish for the matter to be raised, for example, in a Notice of Motion.

Councillor McIlveen thanked Councillor Smith for raising the matter and he was aware that the public was frustrated with the current situation but he was also mindful of the health and safety implications. He urged the Council to look at the protocols carefully and have them reflect the views of Members so that they could justify the decisions the Council was making.

Alderman Carson questioned how many incidents had taken place on the HRC sites to date. In response the Director said that he was most aware of the incident which had occurred recently in Kircubbin and that had necessitated input from the Health and Safety officer.

In conclusion Councillor Woods urged officers not to prioritise the car since services needed to be available to everyone whether or not they owned a car. The Director stressed that the purpose of the HRCs was to provide a means of disposal of large, bulky items that didn’t fit into the wheeled bins and in that context they are specifically designed for vehicular access. He confirmed that the vast majority of people who visited the sites did so by car, since much of the material brought on site was bulky and often heavy.

**RESOLVED**, on the proposal of Councillor Dunlop, seconded by Councillor Woods, that the minutes be adopted.

7.3. **Regeneration and Development Committee dated 7 March 2019**

PREVIOUSLY CIRCULATED:- Copy of the above minutes.

**RESOLVED**, on the proposal of Alderman McDowell, seconded by Alderman Smith, that the minutes be adopted.

7.3.1. **Belfast Region City Deal – Updated Heads of Terms**

(Appendix II)

The Item would be discussed In Committee later in the meeting.
7.4. **Corporate Services Committee dated 12 March 2019**

PREVIOUSLY CIRCULATED:- Copy of the above minutes.

In respect of Item 30.3 page 41 – Notice of Motion

Councillor Armstrong-Cotter proposed that Item 30.3 from the Corporate Services Committee meeting be discussed by the full meeting of Council. Councillor Menagh seconded that.

(Having declared an interest Councillor McAlpine left the meeting at 7.30 pm).

(Councillor Adair left the meeting at 7.30 pm).

**Notice of Motion submitted by Councillor Smart, Councillor Ferguson, Councillor Menagh, Councillor McIlveen, Councillor Armstrong-Cotter and Councillor Kennedy.**

‘That this Council writes to Permanent Secretary for the Department of Education, Mr Derek Baker, confirming our clear demand to see the continuation of non-selective post primary education in Newtownards. Highlight that the town, despite its large size and projected growth now only has one school with this offering, in the form of Movilla High School, where there is potential for closure. Further adding that we as a Council and on behalf of the residents of Newtownards will not accept closure without alternative non-selective post primary education being secured, within the town and in a timely manner, guaranteeing continuity of provision. Lastly, confirming that as a Council and community planning partner, we are happy to work with the Department of Education and the Education Authority in any way possible to realise a sustainable non-selective education option for the people of Newtownards.’

Councillor Armstrong-Cotter stressed the importance of non-selective, post primary education in Newtownards which was the 8th largest town in Northern Ireland, with a population of approximately 30,000 residents and thousands more homes expected to be built over the coming years.

She questioned why there was no support from the Education Authority for a school in the town. The Authority only looked at schools and not the area they represented. Movilla High School had gone through a rough patch, but the current Principal was determined to change that around and the school was showing dramatically improved results at GCSE level. The community around the school supported it and it had become a community hub outside school hours.

She stressed that Newtownards deserved a secondary school and urged those involved in decision making about it to take an holistic approach. She could not accept Movilla High School closing unless there was a school to replace it. She thought it unacceptable that towns with smaller populations had non-selective secondaries while the children of Newtownards needed to travel to other towns to be educated. She called for increased school investment for Newtownards.
Councillor Menagh agreed thinking that it could not be justified that smaller towns had suitable non-selective secondary schools while Newtownards did not. He had visited the school the previous day and had been very impressed with the education being provided. He praised the Principal who he reported was working tirelessly to create what was a happy and improving school. He would trust that all Members would be in support of the school concluding that it played a major contribution to the life of the east end of Newtownards.

(Councillor Adair entered the meeting at 7.37 pm).

Councillor McIlveen concurred fully with all of the Members comments. He considered that the elephant in the room was the impact on the other schools within the Borough. He thought that Movilla had been poorly treated by the Department and the building of shiny new schools such as Bangor Academy and Nendrum College were always a draw for new pupils. If a school was built in Newtownards it would be used. Newtownards contained two of the most deprived parts of Northern Ireland and he wondered what message the situation was sending to the local population. The town deserved the same facilities as other areas enjoyed and he compared what was available in Omagh in comparison to Newtownards.

Alderman McDowell stated that he also fully supported a non-selective post primary school in Newtownards. Every day local children were leaving their town in buses. He thought it a rerun of what had happened to Scrabo High School. He stressed that the grammar and non-selective options were both important and they should be looking at education with fresh eyes. Movilla High School was an improving school and needed support for that to continue. The Council played a role in community development and the Community Plan and should strengthen the case for the school.

Alderman Gibson insisted that rumours often closed schools since enrolment numbers began to fall. He thought that the school should be given a fair chance and the non-selective aspect for the town was also of great importance.

Councillor Cathcart asked Members to imagine what would happen if Movilla High School was not there. Pressure would be increased at Bangor Academy and other places. A new school would transform Newtownards like it had done in Bangor.

Alderman Carson remarked that Movilla High had been his old school and so naturally he would be supportive of it. He said that he would not repeat the previous comments but insisted the school was still struggling and Members should unite in making sure it stayed open by supporting the amendment. Councillor Thompson also had a family connection to the school and fully supported it and had sat on the PTA. He thought the lack of having a sixth form had not helped the growth of the school.

Councillor Kennedy concurred by explaining that good local schools were central to the success of any area. Newtownards was a large enough town to warrant good secondary level education provision. He felt the school had been abandoned by decision makers in government departments and viewed what was happening currently as a carbon copy of what had happened in Dundonald. Over 100 children
left Dundonald each day for other schools and parents could not be blamed for the
decisions they were taking in securing suitable education for their children.

(Councillor Muir entered the meeting at 7.55 pm).

Alderman Fletcher congratulated the Principal of Movilla High School and its staff for
the massive achievements the school had made and considered that a letter of
support to the school be sent on behalf of every Member represented in the Council.

The Mayor concluded that he was in support of all of the comments. It was not the
building or the name that was important but the education available to young people.
Newtownards was an area with a growing population, and it was only right that
quality secondary provision was available to all young people.

Members agreed to do all in their power to support the school and to work with the
Education Authority to deliver results.

**RESOLVED, on the proposal of Councillor Cathcart, seconded by Councillor
Menagh that the Notice of Motion be adopted.**

(Councillor McAlpine entered the meeting at 8 pm).

In respect of Item 30.5 page 44 – Notice of Motion

Arising out of the minutes Councillor Smith proposed, seconded by Councillor
Menagh that his Notice of Motion about Councillor mileage be heard.

**Notice of Motion submitted by Councillor Smith and Councillor Menagh**

“This Council will reduce the rate paid to Councillors for mileage from 65p per mile to
45p per mile. This will bring Councillor mileage in line with HMRC rates.

It is worth noting that over the course of the Council term (including the shadow year)
it is estimated Councillors will have cost the ratepayer almost £90,000 in mileage.

Had we operated at 45p per mile rather than 65p we could have saved ratepayers
almost £30,000.

We also ask officers to bring back a report which looked at staff mileage costs. Staff
mileage runs at over £300,000 per year and again we should look at what savings
could be made if we apply HMRC rates rather than the enhanced rates currently
paid.

This Council will only consider reducing staff mileage rates once a report has been
brought back for consideration.”

Councillor Smith reported that in 2016 he and Councillor Menagh had brought
forward a similar proposal to the one more recently and he asked for Members
support for the Motion.
The proposal was that the Council should have the same rates as other parts of the public sector. He recognised that ratepayers were finding the current economic times challenging and questioned why Members should get a higher rate for mileage than nurses for example.

The Department for Communities and local government generally should move to HMRC rates and noted that some Councils in England had chosen to use the lower rate to be prudent with ratepayers money.

Councillor Menagh informed Members that he had never claimed mileage but he did not wish to see other employees of Council penalised for any decision made in the Chamber.

Councillor McIlveen announced that he had nothing to hide, having never claimed a penny of mileage, even as a Mayor of Ards he had used his own car at his own expense. He explained the reason that Members were employees of the Council and needed to be on the same conditions as other Council staff. He could not propose the motion holistically and believed that it should not be discussed in the current forum. He agreed that Members were well paid but if he considered the hours of work he was putting in to his role as Councillor he would be paid less than the minimum wage.

Alderman Carson explained that the only time The Chronicle phoned him was when Councillor expenses were in the news. As a Councillor he lived further than others away from his place of work. If he lived closer to work it would not be a matter to him either. He stated that he sat on 14 public bodies and used his car extensively in doing that. He therefore could not support Councillor Smith’s Motion.

Alderman Graham insisted that he could not seek to diminish the terms and conditions of Council staff and he thought that it was the Members role to look after them as best they could. He added that to his credit Councillor Smith had been consistent on the issue for many years. He thought that often Members were not receiving payment for the duties they undertook and so it would be wrong to reduce travel expenses at the same time. The most important issue was that no one claimed for items to which they were not entitled. He agreed with Councillor McIlveen that he thought that the matter should not be discussed in an elected chamber.

Councillor Smith had requested a recorded vote and on being put to the meeting, 6 voted FOR, 25 voted AGAINST, 3 ABSTAINED and 6 were ABSENT, the Motion FELL.

FOR (6) Councillors
Brooks
Cooper
McClean
Menagh
Robinson
Smith

AGAINST (25) Aldermen
Carson
Fletcher
Gibson
Girvan
Graham
Henry

ABSTAINING (3) Councillors
McKee
Woods
Smart

ABSENT (6) Councillors
Boyle
Edmund
Ferguson
Martin
Walker
Wilson
Councillor McIlveen proposed an amendment to the Motion which was seconded by Councillor Armstrong-Cotter.

“That officers produce a report with regard to the collective bargaining agreement as it relates to the travelling expenses of Councillors and staff.”

He considered that if the Council was going to look at the matter it should do so from a basis of full information. Councillor Armstrong-Cotter also stated that she had never claimed mileage but believed the amendment would allow for an opportunity to look at the issue in a reasonable and rationale way. She congratulated her colleague Councillor McIlveen for bringing the Motion forward.

Councillor Smith stated that he would be happy to support the amendment even if it was somewhat lacklustre. He and Councillor Menagh had brought the Motion originally and it was encouraging to see other Members coming along in support of it.

A recorded vote was requested on the amendment and on being put to the meeting, with 33 voting FOR, 0 voting AGAINST, 1 ABSTAINING and 6 ABSENT, the amendment was declared CARRIED.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FOR (33)</th>
<th>AGAINST (0)</th>
<th>ABSTAINING (1)</th>
<th>ABSENT (6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aldermen</td>
<td>Councillor</td>
<td>Councillors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carson</td>
<td>Smart</td>
<td>Boyle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fletcher</td>
<td></td>
<td>Edmund</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gibson</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ferguson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girvan</td>
<td></td>
<td>Martin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graham</td>
<td></td>
<td>Walker</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry</td>
<td></td>
<td>Wilson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irvine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9
Keery
McDowell
Smith
**Councillors**
Adair
Allen
Armstrong-Cotter
Brooks
Cathcart
Chambers
Cooper
Cummings
Douglas
Dunlop
Dunne
Gilmour
Kennedy
McAlpine
McIlveen
McClelland
McKee
Menagh
Muir
Robinson
Smith
Thompson
Woods

**RESOLVED**, on the proposal of Councillor McIlveen, seconded by Councillor Armstrong-Cotter that the amended Motion be adopted and that officers produce a report with regard to the collective bargaining agreement as it relates to the travelling expenses of Councillors and staff.

**FURTHER RESOLVED** on the proposal of Councillor Gilmour, seconded by Councillor McIlveen, that the minutes of the Corporate Services Committee be adopted.

**7.4.1 Veterans’ Day 2019 and Proposal to Mark 75th Anniversary of the D-Day Landings**

PREVIOUSLY CIRCULATED:- Report dated 15 March 2019 from the Director of Organisational Development and Administration outlining proposals to mark the 75th Anniversary of the D-Day Landings.

**Veterans’ Day 2019 - Update**
At the meeting of the Corporate Services Committee on 12 March 2019, a report was tabled on proposals for Veterans’ Day 2019.

It was agreed that the recommendation contained in the report be adopted, subject to confirmation from the Royal British Legion that representatives were satisfied with
the proposals. The Council had since received confirmation of same from representatives of Newtownards and Bangor branches.

Proposal to Mark 75th Anniversary of D-Day Landings
Arising out of the debate on the above, an amendment was agreed to add that a report be brought back to the Council on the possibility of holding a modest 75th anniversary of D-Day event at Eisenhower Pier on Saturday, 8 June 2019.

Some members may recall that, on the 50th Anniversary of D-Day, D-Day veterans paraded in Bangor and a replica of the Lone Sailor statue that stood in Washington DC was presented to the Council. On the 60th Anniversary of D-Day, legacy North Down Borough Council hosted significant events during which the North Pier was renamed the Eisenhower Pier. That event was attended by General Eisenhower’s granddaughter.

However, in 2019 there was no budget for the event, so it was suggested that the “modest” event should take the form of a solemn service of commemoration. Enquiries were currently being made about the possibility and associated costs of adding a small additional panel to the existing Second World War mosaic, or a small plaque adjacent to the existing plaque specifically marking the 75th Anniversary of the D-Day Landings. At the time of writing, those enquiries were ongoing. An additional mosaic or plaque would require planning permission, for which the application would cost £831. The outcome of the application was unlikely to be determined prior to 8 June 2019.

Special Guests
It was suggested in the original Veterans’ Day report that the Guest of Honour would be the US Consul General Elizabeth Kennedy Trudeau. Ms Trudeau had since notified officers that she was not available for the Veterans’ Day event on 15 June 2019 but was happy to attend a D-Day Commemoration event on Saturday, 8 June 2019.

RECOMMENDED that the Council:

1. proceeds with its plans for Veterans’ Day on Saturday, 15 June 2019 in Newtownards as outlined in the report to the Corporate Services Committee on 12 March 2019 but without the attendance of the US Consul General (all efforts would be made to identify a suitable alternative guest; and
2. holds a modest event to mark the 75th Anniversary of D-Day at Eisenhower Pier, Bangor, on Saturday, 8 June 2019, with the US Consul General in attendance (further details to be reported to the Council at its meeting in April 2019).

Councillor Chambers was delighted to read the report that Bangor would have a modest service since he had brought forward that amendment and paying respects in a dignified way would be important in marking the occasion.

Councillor Cooper felt that it was imperative that those who did not come home were honoured. Councillor Dunlop was slightly disappointed with the event planned. Bangor Bay would have been the last sight of land for many as they headed off to
war. North Down had marked the event fully in 1994 and after that time the Borough had been thought of as the events capital of Northern Ireland and was an example for other Councils to follow. It was regretful that there were not sufficient funds to mark the occasion more fully and she concluded by pointing out the Borough’s great military traditions.

AGREED TO RECOMMEND, on the proposal of Councillor Chambers, seconded by Councillor Cooper, that the recommendation be adopted.

(Councillor Dunlop left the meeting at 8.28 pm).

7.5. Community and Wellbeing Committee dated 13 March 2019

PREVIOUSLY CIRCULATED:- Copy of the above minutes.

Councillor Adair referred to Item 15 – Tennis Facilities Refurbishment and asked the Director of Community and Wellbeing if that would include Greyabbey and Ballywalter. It had been alluded to in the report but he wanted to have a record of a firm commitment to courts which needed to receive investment. The Director confirmed that to be the case.

RESOLVED, on the proposal of Alderman Irvine, seconded by Councillor Dunne, that the minutes be adopted.

8. REQUEST FOR DEPUTATION

8.1. Congress – Irish Congress of Trade Unions Northern Ireland Committee
(Appendix III)

PREVIOUSLY CIRCULATED:- Copy letter dated 13 March 2019 from the Irish Congress of Trade Unions Northern Ireland Committee.

RESOLVED, on the proposal of Alderman Carson, seconded by Councillor McKee, that the deputation be heard by the appropriate Committee.

9. RESOLUTION

(Appendix IV)

PREVIOUSLY CIRCULATED:- Copy letter dated 27 February 2019 from the Chief Executive of Newry, Mourne and Down District Council.

RESOLVED, on the proposal of Alderman Graham, seconded by Alderman Girvan, that the Council supports the resolution.

(Councillor Dunlop entered the meeting at 8.30 pm)
10. COURSES/INVITATIONS ETC.

10.1. The Regimental Association UDR – The Ulster Defence Regiment Day Event on Sunday 7th April 2019, Palace Barracks, Holywood

PREVIOUSLY CIRCULATED:- Details in respect of the above event.

Councillor Cooper remarked that he had attended the event the previous year and it had been very worthwhile remembering the gallant men and women who had served their countries. He encouraged Members to consider attending this year and it was advised that Members should contact Democratic Services if they wished to attend.

RESOLVED, on the proposal of Councillor Cooper, seconded by Councillor Menagh, that the recommendation be adopted.

11. CONSULTATION DOCUMENT

11.1. Consultation Response on Allergen Labelling (Appendix V)

PREVIOUSLY CIRCULATED:- Report dated 27 March 2019 from the Director of Community and Wellbeing detailing that the Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (DEFRA) was currently seeking comments on the proposed amendments of the Food Information Regulations (NI) 2014.

Those amendments related to the mandatory information, form of expression and presentation of allergen labelling information for foods that were prepacked for direct sale (PPDS) to the consumer on the same premises from which they were sold.

The Northern Ireland Food Managers Group (NIFMG), which had representation from all 11 Councils, had drafted an agreed response to the consultation and it was recommended that that be submitted as Ards and North Down Borough Council’s response.

The full consultation document was attached as an appendix.

RECOMMENDED that the Council approve the response to DEFRA’s consultation on the amendments to the Food Information Regulations (NI) 2014.

RESOLVED, on the proposal of Alderman Irvine, seconded by Councillor Graham, that the recommendation be adopted.

12. SEALING DOCUMENTS

PREVIOUSLY CIRCULATED :-

(a) Grant of Right of Burials Nos 13004-13041
(b) Transfer/Assignment on Probate or Succession of Right of Burial – Movilla Cemetery
(c) Request from NIE to carry out works and for an easement over land at Cootehall Road, Crawfordsburn
(d) Car Loan Deirdre Doddy

RESOLVED, on the proposal of Alderman Carson, seconded by Councillor Adair, that the Council Seal be attached to the above documents.

13. TRANSFER OF RIGHTS OF BURIAL

The following transfer applications were received:-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Transferred to</th>
<th>Cemetery</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G L Laird</td>
<td>A Laird</td>
<td>Movilla</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RESOLVED, that the above transfer be approved.

14. NOTICES OF MOTION – STATUS REPORT (FILE CG12172)
(Appendix VI)

PREVIOUSLY CIRCULATED:- Report dated 21 March from the Director of Organisational Development and Administration and attached Status Report in respect of Notices of Motion.

That report was a standing item on the Council agenda each month and its aim was to keep Members updated on the outcome of Motions. Please note that as each Motion was dealt with it would be removed from the report.

RECOMMENDED that the Council notes the report.

RESOLVED, on the proposal of Alderman Graham, seconded by Alderman Carson, that the recommendation be adopted.

15. NOTICES OF MOTION

15.1. Notice of Motion submitted by Councillor Boyle, Councillor Thompson, Councillor Adair, Councillor Edmund, Alderman Carson and Councillor McAlpine

That this Council agrees to write to Katrina Godfrey, Permanent Secretary of the Department for Infrastructure requesting an urgent meeting to discuss the provision of a footpath/pedestrian footway in Ballyhalbert, commencing on the shore side of the road opposite Ballyhalbert Gospel Hall (38 Short Road) and concluding on the shore side at the mini-roundabout linking Shore Road to Harbour Road. (Opposite Talbot House at 1 High Street, Ballyhalbert).

RESOLVED, on the proposal of Councillor Adair, seconded by Alderman Carson, that the Notice of Motion be referred to the Environment Committee in June 2019.

15.2 Notice of Motion submitted by Councillor Cooper and Councillor Boyle
That this Council continually provides two portable toilets for the annual Goldsprings True Defenders Flute Band in Comber, to ensure cross community harmonisation and provide adequate public access to toiletry facilities.

Councillor Cooper proposed that the Motion be heard at the Council meeting since deferring it would mean that it would be too late for the event. The proposal was seconded by Councillor Menagh. It was stressed that the annual event brought many people in to the town centre and it was important that there were adequate toilet facilities for the day.

Councillor Mclveen proposed an amendment to Councillor Cooper’s motion which was seconded by Councillor Armstrong-Cotter.

“That this Council provides two portable toilets for this year’s Goldsprings True Defenders Flute Band in Comber and requests officers to review the provision of portable toilets at public events to ensure equitable and fair provision.

Furthermore, requests that public toilets in Comber are publicly accessible for the event.”

Councillor Mclveen had concerns about Councillor Cooper’s motion due to the commitment to an annual spend. Currently there was a gap in the policy and the Council faced the same debate each year regarding the event in Comber. He said that each event which the Council ran must be treated equally. If a policy was put in place a consistent approach could be applied throughout the Council when making decisions.

Other Members spoke in agreement and believed that it was important to have a policy in place.

Councillor Cooper understood Councillor Mclveen’s angle on the matter but in reality he was only asking for the provision of two portable toilets and did not consider it to be a significant expense for the Council especially considering it was the biggest public event to take place in Comber each year.

A recorded vote was requested and when put to the meeting with 31 voting FOR, 2 voting AGAINST, 1 ABSTAINING and 6 ABSENT, the amendment was declared CARRIED.

FOR (31)  
Aldermen
Carson  
Fletcher  
Gibson  
Girvan  
Graham  
Henry  
Irvine  
Keery

AGAINST (2)  
Councillors
Cooper  
Menagh

ABSTAINING (1)  
Councillor
Smart

ABSENT (6)  
Councillors
Boyle  
Edmund  
Ferguson  
Martin  
Walker  
Wilson
RESOLVED, on the proposal of Councillor McIlveen, seconded by Councillor Armstrong-Cotter that this Council provides two portable toilets for this year’s Goldsprings True Defenders Flute Band in Comber and requests officers to review the provision of portable toilets at public events to ensure equitable and fair provision.

Furthermore, requests that the public toilets in Comber are publicly accessible for the event.

16. STREET NAMING PIRRIE DEVELOPMENT, COMBER (FILE FP/2019/0484/MAST/91200)

PREVIOUSLY CIRCULATED:- Report dated 26 February 2019 from the Director of Environment detailing that a development comprising of 70 dwellings was currently under construction on lands at Clattering Ford, Comber. The developer suggested Pirrie Avenue, Pirrie Lane, Pirrie Walk and Pirrie Wood, Comber.

Pirrie was an old family name relating to the founding family of the development at Clattering Ford, Comber. The lands have long been farmed by the Andrews and Pirrie family, tracing back to Agnes Pirrie, 19th Century. The Pirrie name had a strong resonance in the area through the Andrews connection and the contributions of both families to the shipyard in Belfast and the building of the Titanic.

RECOMMENDED that Pirrie Avenue, Pirrie Lane, Pirrie Wood and Pirrie Walk, be adopted.
That Council accept the general name and delegate acceptance of suffixes to the
Building Control department.

RESOLVED, on the recommendation of Councillor Cummings, seconded by
Alderman Gibson, that the recommendation be adopted.

17. STREET NAMING VILLAGE BROW, CRAWFORDSBURN (FILE
FP/2018/1056/MAST/91200)

PREVIOUSLY CIRCULATED:- Report dated 27 February 2019 from the Director of
Environment detailing that a development comprising of 40 dwellings was currently
under construction on lands to the rear of 6 & 8 Main Street, Crawfordsburn. The
developer suggested the name Village Brow, since the site climbed up from Main
Street and the houses would sit on the brow of the hill in the village of
Crawfordsburn.

RECOMMENDED that Village Brow be adopted.

That the Council accept the general name and delegate acceptance of suffixes to the
Building Control department.

RESOLVED, on the proposal of Councillor Dunne, seconded by Councillor
Smith, that the recommendation be adopted.

18. PLACE OF MARRIAGE APPROVAL (FILE APM 142/90101)

PREVIOUSLY CIRCULATED:- Report dated 6 March 2019 from the Director of
Environment detailing that the following application for the grant of an approval for a
Place of Marriage had been received:

Newtownards Sailing Club

Applicant: David Corkhill, 37 The Oaks, Newtownards

Day and hours of use: Monday to Sunday at times deemed suitable by
officiator.

No objections had been received to any of the applications.

RECOMMENDED that the approval is granted.

RESOLVED on the proposal of Councillor Menagh, seconded by Councillor
Dunlop, that the recommendation be adopted.

(Alderman Carson left the meeting at 8.49 pm).

19. DISPLAY BEDS POLICY OUTLINE (FILEPCA5)
(Appendix VII)
PREVIOUSLY CIRCULATED:- Report dated 20 March 2019 from the Director of Community and Wellbeing detailing that in February, the Council was advised of its provision for display beds that were created at the following locations across the Borough:

- Post Office, Bangor
- Ballymenoch Park, Holywood
- Court Square, Newtownards
- East Street, Donaghadee
- Comber Square, Comber

Historically, the displays had been installed on an ad hoc basis as a result of a written request from interested organisations/groups.

Currently there was no charge for the use of the display beds and Council install the display and bears the full cost of installation. Dependent upon the nature of detail in the display, the cost could vary from £600 - £700 to cover labour and materials.

The display beds provided an opportunity for local organisations and groups to highlight key dates and significant anniversaries. In addition, the Council had created displays to commemorate significant anniversaries such as the World War One Centenary and the Royal Air Force Centenary.

There was currently no policy regarding the allocation of the display beds. Council agreed that a policy on making determinations should be developed.

Officers had discussed and proposed a framework of criteria which could be incorporated into a policy. The criteria had also been considered by the Corporate Leadership Team and had be attached for Members’ consideration.

The Policy Criteria would also be considered by the internal and external screening groups on 26th March 2019 and a verbal update would be provided at the Council meeting.

RECOMMENDED that the Council approve the attached Policy Criteria as the basis for considering applications for the continued provision of display beds in the Borough, and that the policy would be implemented from the 1st April 2019 subject to screening by the equality working groups.

RESOLVED, on the proposal of Alderman Smith, seconded by Alderman Irvine, that the recommendation be adopted.

20. ARDS AND NORTH DOWN YOUTH COUNCIL (CYP1)

PREVIOUSLY CIRCULATED:- Report dated 14 March 2019 from the Director of Community and Wellbeing detailing that Members would be aware that an Ards and North Down Youth Council had been established within the borough. The Youth Council was a product of a Capacity Building and Youth Leadership Programme for
peace building, which was supported by the Special EU Programmes Body and managed by the Ards and North Down PEACE IV Partnership.

The project was being delivered by the Northern Ireland Youth Forum and it commenced in September 2017. It aimed to work with young people aged 12-24 years to enable them to become more active citizens to develop a more shared and cohesive society through a targeted programme with two elements. Firstly, a cross community and cross border youth voice programme linked to the creation of 8 cross community youth forums which would connect to the emerging Youth Council for the area. The second element was a mentoring and peer leadership programme working with youth mentors and champions recruited from areas where the visible manifestations of conflict were more pronounced aimed at building greater awareness of cultural diversity and cohesion among young people.

The Northern Ireland Youth Forum was contracted to achieve a number of SMART objectives, including:

- The engagement of a minimum of 96 young people aged 12-24 years from targeted areas across the borough.
- The establishment of a minimum of 8 local youth forums within the borough. a minimum of 12 young people participating in each forum.
- Support and training for the young people.
- The establishment of an Ards and North Down Youth Council drawn from the membership of the Youth Forums.

The Youth Council was formally established on 10 February 2019 at a meeting at Ganaway Activity Centre, attended by a number of Councillors, Members of the Peace IV Partnership, SEUPB and Council Officers.

The Youth Council also gave a deputation to the Community and Wellbeing Committee on 13 March 2019. At the meeting they requested that a number of Councillors be appointed to work with the Youth Council, attend their bi-monthly meetings and further explore issues and topics of importance to the young people. In addition, the Youth Council was also interested in acting in a consultative capacity for the Council for projects, plans and policies.

Based on the above request it was recommended that Council established a cross party working group to work with the Youth Council at the Council Annual General Meeting on 22 May 2019.

RECOMMENDED that Council approves the establishment of a cross party working group to work with the Youth Council at the Council Annual Meeting on 22 May 2019.

RESOLVED, on the proposal of Alderman Smith, seconded by Councillor Smith, that the recommendation be adopted.
21. REQUEST TO USE CASTLE PARK FOR A FUN FAIR

The Chairman advised that the item would be taken in committee.

NOTED.

22. GRANT OF OUTDOOR ENTERTAINMENT LICENCE – MCD PRODUCTIONS – SNOW PATROL CONCERT (FILE LR100)

PREVIOUSLY CIRCULATED:- Report dated 19 March 2019 from the Director of Environment detailing that an application had been received for the grant of an outdoor Entertainment Licence:

MCD PRODUCTIONS – Snow Patrol Concert

Applicant address: 7 Park Road, Dun Laoghaire, Co. Dublin

Day and hours of use: Saturday the 25 May 2019 between the hours of 11am and 11pm

Type of Entertainment: Outdoor musical entertainment

Location: Ward Park, Gransha Road, Bangor

No objections had been received to the application following its public advertisement.

It was proposed that the following additional conditions be applied to the licence:

1. That the applicant provides an Event Management plan to the satisfaction of the PSNI, NIFRS and the Council;

2. The Licensee shall undertake independent noise monitoring of the Event to the Council’s specification, provide a contact for any public complaints and shall comply with all requirements of the Licensor for abatement of noise.

3. The licence shall be issued following the agreement of the PSNI, NIFRS and the Council.

RECOMMENDED that the Council grants the licence subject to the additional licence conditions detailed in this report.

RESOLVED, on the proposal of Alderman Irvine, seconded by Councillor Cathcart, that the recommendation be adopted.

23. GRANT OF INDOOR ENTERTAINMENT LICENCE – CLOUGHEY PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH, MAIN ROAD, CLOUGHEY (FILE LR100)
PREVIOUSLY CIRCULATED:- Report from the Director of the Environment detailing that an application for the grant of licence had been received:

**Cloughey Presbyterian Church, Main Road, Cloughey**

**Applicant**: Leonard Brown, Quarry Road, Greyabbey

Day and hours of use: 14 unspecified days within the next 12 months.

Monday to Sunday:

**Type of Entertainment**:

- Theatrical performance
- Dancing, singing or music or any other entertainment of a like kind

No objections had been received to this application.

RECOMMENDED that the license is granted.

RESOLVED, on the proposal of Councillor Adair, seconded by Councillor Thompson, that the recommendation be adopted.

**EXCLUSION OF PUBLIC/PRESS**

AGREED TO RECOMMEND, on the proposal of Councillor Cathcart, seconded by Alderman Graham, that the public/press be excluded during the discussion of the undernoted items of confidential business.

(Having declared an Interest in Item 24 Councillor Cathcart and Alderman Gibson left the meeting at 8.51 pm).

24. **TENDER REPORT – BRING SITE SERVICE CONTRACTS**  
(Appendix VIII)

***IN CONFIDENCE***

Schedule 6 – Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the Council holding that information).

25. **EXTENSION OF MAIN DOG KENNELLING CONTRACT (FILE 92012)**

***IN CONFIDENCE***

Schedule 6 – Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the Council holding that information).
26. **TENDER FOR THE PROVISION OF AGENCY WORKERS**

***IN CONFIDENCE***

Schedule 6 – Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the Council holding that information).

7.3.1 **BELFAST REGION CITY DEAL – UPDATED HEADS OF TERMS**

***IN CONFIDENCE***

Schedule 6 – Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the Council holding that information).

27. **REQUEST FROM MOHAN’S FUNFAIR TO USE CASTLE PARK TO OPERATE A FUNFAIR OVER THE EASTER PERIOD (FILE LP423)**

(Appendix IX)

***IN CONFIDENCE***

Schedule 6 – Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the Council holding that information).

**RE-ADMITTANCE OF PUBLIC/PRESS**

AGREED TO RECOMMEND, on the proposal of Councillor Douglas, seconded by Councillor Adair, that the public/press be re-admitted to the meeting.

**TERMINATION OF MEETING**

The meeting terminated at 9.02 pm.
ARS AND NORTH DOWN BOROUGH COUNCIL

A special meeting of the Planning Committee was held in the Council Chamber, 2 Church Street, Newtownards on Thursday, 21 March 2019 at 7.00pm.

PRESENT:

In the Chair: Councillor Cathcart

Aldermen: Carson   Graham
Fletcher   Keery
Gibson   McDowell

Councillors: McLveen   Walker
Thompson

Officers: Director of Regeneration, Development and Planning (S McCullough), Head of Planning (A McCullough), Principal Planning and Technical Officer (L Maginn) and Democratic Services Officer (J Glasgow)

Also in attendance: A Stephens (Agent - Matrix Planning Consultancy)
A Gilmore (Clarehill Resident)
G Wood (Clanmil Housing)
A Webb (Baker Tilly Mooney Moore)
C Bryson (Gravis Planning)

1. **APOLOGIES**

Apologies for inability to attend were received from Alderman Girvan, Councillor McKee and Councillor Dunne.

2. **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

No declarations of interest were notified.

3. **PLANNING APPLICATIONS**

3.1 LA06/2018/0742/F – Former Petrol Station at No 375 Old Holywood Road, Holywood – Demolition of former petrol station, retail unit and canopy for redevelopment for Nos 14 x 2 apartments for social housing, including associated car parking, landscaping and all other ancillary site works (Appendices I - IV)

PREVIOUSLY CIRCULATED:- Original Case Officer’s Report, Addendum to original Case Officer Report, 2nd Addendum and Note of Site Meeting.

**DEA:** Holywood and Clandeboyce
Committee Interest: Application with 6 or more representations contrary to Officer recommendation

Proposal: Demolition of former petrol filling station, retail unit and canopy for redevelopment for Nos. 14 X 2 apartments for social housing, including associated car parking, landscaping and all other ancillary site works

Site Location: Former petrol filling station at 375 Old Holywood Road, Holywood

Recommendation: Approval

The Head of Planning detailed that Members would be familiar with this application as it was previously presented in February 2019 as six or more objections had been received from individual addresses contrary to the Officer’s recommendation of approval. Following concerns expressed by Planning Committee in relation to the scale and massing and parking, it was deferred to enable a site visit to take place at which 9 members attended to take in the context of the site and its surroundings.

The Planning Officer at the February meeting had at that time set out the planning history of the site, which was a former petrol filling station (PFS) and was then approved in 2012 for a mixed use development comprising of 2 ground floor retail units and 8 x 2 bed apartments.

The Head of Planning referred to a number of visuals, the first showed the site on the approach along the Old Holywood Road. Referring to an image taken from Google Earth Pro, the Head of Planning explained that was useful in showing the site in context of the surrounding development and the existing footprint of the petrol filling station shop set back towards the rear boundary of the site with Clarehill Lane and awning over the forecourt.

The Head of Planning highlighted that the previous approval granted on the site for redevelopment of the PFS for a mixed use development comprising of 2 ground floor retail units with 8 apartments above. She referred to the visual which demonstrated the elevations of the development previously approved in 2012.

The Head of Planning showed Members the proposed footprint against that previously approved for the retail and residential development, as some members had enquired in relation to that at the February meeting.

The proposal presented to February’s committee comprised of a 4 storey building housing 18 apartments and carrying a shortfall of 8 car parking spaces against the recommended standards. The Head of Planning displayed the 4 storey building with front, rear and side elevations respectively.

Pursuant to the Committee’s concerns, the applicant had sought to remedy the Committee’s perceived concerns ahead of any motion being tabled for a refusal by submission of a revised proposal. That had reduced the overall aspect to a three storey building, with a reduction in the number of apartments from 18 to 14. 19 parking spaces were proposed, representing a shortfall of 2 against the recommended standards. The Committee had expressed concern about the scale and massing of the proposal, and the revisions sought to address those concerns. Whilst there was only a reduction in overall height from 10.08m to 9.46m, the scheme had been reduced from 4s to 3s, and the flat roofed component which may
have given the impression of bulk had been amended to a double pitched roof. It was considered that effectively minimised the overall scale and massing when viewed from the main public viewpoints.

It reads closely with adjacent block of 1-4 Clarehill Lane and building was set back 4m from the road and there was still a separation distance of 16m from the rear elevation to the rear boundary.

Whilst there was a perceived shortfall of 2 spaces, as previously explained and as detailed within the reports, policy enabled a flexible approach to car parking standards where the site was in a highly accessible location and well served by public transport, or where the development could benefit from parking capacity in nearby public car parks or adjacent on-street parking. That was considered to be the case in this proposal. Additionally, evidence was previously provided of a lesser take up in car ownership in social housing units. It should also be noted that previous approvals made by Council for apartments at the former Priory Inn development at Stewarts Place (approved April 2018), an apartment development at Strand Avenue, Holywood (approved March 2017), and 30 apartments at Church View and Pattons Lane (also approved March 2017), all benefitted from a reduction in parking spaces due to the proximity of the sites to the town centre, availability of on street parking or public transport. In this case it was considered that a shortfall of 2 spaces could easily be met where there were no parking restrictions on the road, and availability of parking spaces nearby had been noted on a number of site visits, including after 6pm on the evening of the site visit.

The Head of Planning highlighted the block layout in relation to the surrounding development. In terms of the proposed amenity space for the apartments, it should be recognised that the site was only a short distance to the entrance to Redburn Country Park, approximately 250m away.

Referring to another visual, the Head of Planning explained that demonstrated the front elevation along Old Holywood Road in context of the existing terrace at 1-4 Clarehill Lane which had a ridge height of 41.96m compared to the proposal’s ridge height of 42.25m. She noted that the eaves height of Clarehill was more or less level with top of 2nd floor of proposal.

The visuals displayed the levels in context of the existing terrace of housing to the rear at 22-25 Clarehill Lane and demonstrated separation distance of 16m to rear boundary. Creating Places recommended 15m between rear of apartments and the common boundary. There was also a 1.75m high wall proposed along the boundary.

In respect of the Google Earth image that showed the proposed site in context of development to the north also, consisting of a listed building and an extant approval for four dwellings, which were also considered in the assessment of this proposal.

The application was before the Committee with the same recommendation of approval subject to conditions and approval for delegated powers was sought to amend the conditions as appropriate.
The Chairman reminded the Committee of the 7 Members who attended the site visit and also were in attendance this evening. Only those Members could take part in the discussion and vote. Those were Alderman Keery, Alderman Graham, Alderman Fletcher, Alderman McDowell, Councillor Thompson, Councillor Walker and Councillor Cathcart.

The Chairman invited questions from Members.

In relation to the houses behind the site, Alderman Fletcher had not realised that those houses sat lower than the houses beside the site. He referred to the concerns expressed in respect of overlooking and with the houses to the rear being lower down he felt that those concerns were a salient point. Alderman Fletcher asked how the problem could be remedied or if the overlooking would be ignored. Referring to one of the visuals, the Head of Planning demonstrated the difference in the levels which was relatively small between the dwellings. The matter had been considered and she highlighted that there was a 16m separation distance which was beyond the guidance in Creating Places. Furthermore, a 1.5m wall would be installed and it was considered that would assist with the privacy issues. In terms of the layout, the closest dwelling gable was 22 Clarehill Lane of 6.5m and there was also a 16m distance between the common boundary and the elevation which was considered acceptable. There was a reduction in the number of windows at the rear elevation along with smaller windows from what was originally proposed. It was considered that the proposal would have no unacceptable adverse impact on the amenity of the dwellings to the rear.

Alderman Graham asked the Head of Planning to again display the visual of the proposal approved for commercial use with the residential above. The Head of Planning displayed the visual explaining what was originally proposed and she highlighted that was much higher than what was before Members now. That proposal was approved in 2012, the planning permission expired in 2017 however the policy context had not changed in that time.

The Chairman invited Anne Gilmore to come forward who was speaking on behalf of Clarehill Residents against the application. As there was a substantial change to the original application the Chair allowed 5 minutes speaking time if required.

Ms Gilmore explained that the objections remained and one of the main concerns was in respect of car parking which still failed to meet the recommended minimum of 21 spaces for 14 apartments. It could be seen in the local press that the Redburn and Loughview Community Forum had been involved in a struggle to alleviate problems of overflow parking in the area which was causing increasing annoyance to local residents. The amended proposal of high density housing still raised health and safety concerns with the neighbouring residents. Ideally town housing would provide a more satisfactory long term solution and would go someway to addressing the housing need but remove the potential for conflict with the neighbouring residents. Red buses were taken off the route and Ms Gilmore wondered how long a blue bus route would remain. Ms Gilmore questioned the likelihood of mobility cars in social housing and wondered if those would cause an increase. There was no availability of on street car parking surrounding the area and the resident's concerns remained. In terms of the amended proposal, it was still felt that the size of the
proposal would have an overbearing impact in particular for No 1 Clarehill Lane. Ms Gilmore referred to Planning Policy Development Control Advice Note 8 which stated that proposals that would have an adverse, overbearing or dominant effect on an existing property which would result on an unduly impressive living environment was a material planning consideration and the Clarehill residents felt the proposal required such a policy consideration. Ms Gilmore stated that the report referred to the impact in terms of light into her living room window there was also an impact on her bedroom window. The amended proposal was of a modern design and colour and presented an inferior finish, whilst the residents appreciated the current trends were white and grey finishes that style was not in keeping with the surrounding red brick homes. Referring again to planning policy, Ms Gilmore stated that the form and density should be in harmony with adjacent housing and should not detract from the environmental quality, residential amenity or the character of the surrounding area. The residents felt that the development should in keeping and should be red brick. Ms Gilmore highlighted her concerns in terms of the impact and intensity.

The Chairman invited questions from Members.

Alderman Fletcher referred to his earlier question in respect of overlooking and noted that Ms Gilmore had not referred to those concerns in her address. In response Ms Gilmore stated that there were concerns regarding overlooking and the fact that the houses to the rear sat lower that did cause a greater overbearing impact. The residents had suggested that the third floor be taken out and the height of the roof dropped and if that happened the number of car spaces would have been right.

As there were no more questions, the Chairman asked Ms Gilmore to return to the public gallery.

The Chairman invited Andy Stephens (Agent) to come forward who was speaking in support of the application and was also awarded 5 minutes speaking time.

Mr Stephens recalled that the application was previously presented to Committee on 5th February 2019 with a recommendation to approve for 18 x 2bedroom apartments for social housing. Greg Woods from Clanmil Housing was in the public gallery if Members had any questions. As the Head of Planning had highlighted the application was deferred for a site visit, which was undertaken on 14th February to provide members with a better opportunity to consider the site in context. The applicant had listened to the concerns of the Members and objectors and chosen to reduce the scheme, despite the previous recommendation to grant permission.

The alterations consisted of the following:
- A reduction of 4 apartments units
- A reduction from 4 storeys to 3 storeys in height
- A reduction of 6 windows in the rear elevation facing Clarehill Lane (1 living room and 5 bedrooms)
- A reduced ridge height to 9.46m, which was lower than the previous granted mixed-use scheme.
- The roof design had been altered from a flat roof to a double pitched roof, to provide a better relationship with existing buildings and reduced the massing.
• The separation distance of 16m to the common boundary was maintained and was greater than the prescribed threshold and was 22m from building to building.
• The amount of car parking remained the same. However, due to a reduction of 4 apartments the ratio of parking had increased to 1.36 spaces per unit.

The scheme would not set a precedent as there were several examples of 1:1 ratios in Holywood granted permission by the Council. It had been demonstrated that social housing schemes resulted in lower car ownership rates. That had been confirmed by Clannmil at the February Committee Meeting and corroborated by the TRICS data that was included in support of the application. No evidence had been presented to the contrary and there was no parking pressure in the area or significant parking restrictions. The site was located on a key transport corridor with three bus stops located at 40m and 80m to the south and 200m to the north and Ms Gilmore had been observed using the bus. Since all of the alterations were undertaken only one objection was received to the application.

The planning history of the site was a significant material consideration to which adequate weight must be attached in this determination. It provided a benchmark in respect of the scale, massing and position of the previous approved building and its relationship with the existing built environment. Not only was the proposed scheme lower in height and further away from all the existing residential properties at Clarehill Lane, it was much less intensive than the previous mixed use of retail and apartments previously approved. It had been calculated that the development would generate 58 vehicular trips per day compared with 739 vehicular trips for the previously approved mixed used proposal.

The proposed development was high quality in terms of design, materials and detailing. Whilst the building was modern, it was reflective of several apartment blocks that had already been permitted by the Council in Holywood. The proposal would not be out of character with the high-density terraced dwellings in the surrounding area and respects the existing building line, linear form and height of the adjacent terrace.

Mr Stephens highlighted that the applicant had engaged directly with residents from the outset. In addition, significant changes had now been undertaken in response to the concerns raised by the Committee and Residents in February. That demonstrated a willingness to try and accommodate the views and opinions, which Mr Stephens believed should be commended.

The proposal had always been compliant with all aspects of the local development plan, draft plan and regional planning policies. There were no objections from any of the statutory consultees and no evidence had been presented to the contrary. There was no mechanism in the local development plan to provide for social housing hence there was a high demand of 156 units and a significant shortage. The proposal represented a fantastic opportunity to redevelop the derelict petrol filling station for a positive and much needed residential use. Also it would provide visual enhancement of the current degraded site and would undoubtedly improve the overall character and environmental quality of the area by providing an attractive frontage to Old Holywood Road. Mr Stephens sought the Committees endorsement
of the recommendation to allow the development to proceed without delay as there was no justifiable reason to withhold permission.

The Chairman invited questions from Members.

Alderman Fletcher referred to the 21m distance between the buildings and asked if that distance was the contour or horizontal distance. In response Mr Stephens stated that the horizontal distance was 16m to the boundary and 22.5m to the back of the proposed dwelling from the nearest dwelling, there was a difference in levels of 82cm. That was over and above the guidance and he also explained that in terms of policy greater flexibility was given to infill sites in inner urban areas and therefore the application went over that recommended.

Alderman McDowell raised a question regarding the proposal being in keeping with most of the surrounding properties being red brick. The visuals displayed the development with a lot of white and he asked was there anyway the development could be amended to be more in keeping. In respect of the design, Mr Stephens stated that the area was not in an area of townscape character. The surrounding properties were built more than 20 years ago and the applicant did not wish to replicate those as it was viewed that would make the built environment exceptionally boring. What was proposed was a modern contemporary apartment building that would be suitable to be maintained in years to come. Taking the overall context into account there was no justifiable reason to amend the design and he detailed that policy stated that Planning Officers should not be overly prescriptive in terms of design.

Alderman McDowell understood that the applicant did not wish to completely replicate however with the modern buildings he felt that they could sometimes go out of date very quickly if they were too modern and it was about achieving a mix. In relation to the finish he wondered if anything could be done to make that more in keeping as a large white building at the site would really stand out. Mr Stephens noted the current site was a derelict building and was an eye sore. Regarding the finish the application was before the Committee in terms of design and there was plenty of similar style examples in the Holywood area. The Agent had no justifiable concerns, the Planning Officers were content and therefore Mr Stephens stated that there would be no further amendments made to the proposal.

Alderman Graham referred to the slope in the roof and questioned if that came down to the dormer windows. Mr Stephens advised that the eaves were at 7.3m and to the top of the ridge the height was 9.4m. Mr Stephens demonstrated how the eaves were relative to the dormers.

Mr Andy Stephens returned to the public gallery.

Councillor Walker stated that notwithstanding the small number of concerns that still existed the developer had made a big effort to address those concerns.

Proposed by Councillor Walker, seconded by Alderman Keery, that planning permission be granted and that delegated powers be awarded in respect of the conditioning.
Alderman Graham concurred with Councillor Walker, he appreciated the ideal solution would be different however felt the Committee needed to take on board the efforts of the applicant and his agent and it would not be possible to sustain an objection. The concerns had been taken onboard by the Applicant/Agent and he felt that was commendable.

UNANIMOUSLY RESOLVED, on the proposal of Councillor Walker, seconded by Alderman Keery, that planning permission be granted and delegated powers be awarded in respect of the conditioning.

3.2 **LA/06/2018/1279/F – Marine Gardens, Shore Street, Donaghadee (behind War Memorial) – Removal of the existing memorial stone and installation of a new black granite bases with the existing stone placed on top** (Appendix V)

PREVIOUSLY CIRCULATED:- Case Officer’s Report.

**DEA:** Bangor East and Donaghadee  
**Committee Interest:** Council application  
**Proposal:** Removal of the existing memorial stone and installation of a new black granite base with the existing stone placed on top  
**Site Location:** Marine Gardens, Shore Street, Donaghadee (behind War Memorial)  
**Recommendation:** Approval

The Head of Planning outlined that the Planning Committee previously approved the existing memorial stone at its meeting of June 2016. The application merely sought to install a 40cm high granite ‘stand’ and then place the existing stone on top. That was primarily to protect the actual memorial itself from dogs urinating on it, and also provided an easier aspect for people walking past the memorial and taking an interest. The application had been assessed against prevailing policy and was recommended for approval.

Proposed by Alderman Keery, seconded by Councillor Walker, that the recommendation be adopted and that planning permission be granted.

Councillor Walker stated that it was unfortunate that the application was required and that dog owners let their dogs urinate against the memorial.

UNANIMOUSLY RESOLVED, on the proposal of Alderman Keery, seconded by Councillor Walker, that the recommendation be adopted and that planning permission be granted.

EXCLUSION OF PUBLIC/PRESS

AGREED TO RECOMMEND on the proposal Councillor Thompson, seconded by Alderman Carson, that the public/press be excluded during the discussion of the undernoted items of confidential business.
TOWARDS PREFERRED OPTIONS PAPER:

4. EMPLOYMENT LAND REVIEW FOR LDP (ELR)

***IN CONFIDENCE***

4.1 PRESENTATION BY CONSULTANT

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

Schedule 6 – Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person including the Council holding that information.

REPORT (Appendices VI – IX)

5. SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL (SA) INCORPORATING STRATEGIC ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT (SEA) – SCOPING REPORT AND INTERIM SA

(Appendices X, XI)

***IN CONFIDENCE***

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

Schedule 6 – Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person including the Council holding that information.

RE-ADMITTANCE OF PUBLIC/PRESS

AGREED TO RECOMMEND, on the proposal of Alderman Keery, seconded by Councillor Walker, that the public/press be re-admitted to the meeting.

LAUNCH OF PREFERRED OPTIONS PAPER

The Professional and Technical Officer advised that the launch of the Preferred Options Paper (POP) would take place on Monday 25th March 2019 at 12 noon in the Town Hall, Arts Centre, Newtownards. All Members were invited to attend and a summary document of the POP would be circulated.

A series of public engagement events would take place across the Borough during the 12 weeks of public consultation which ran from 28 March – 20 June 2019. Those sessions would be advertised in the local press.

NOTED.

(Alderman McDowell re-entered the meeting – 8.52 pm)

TERMINATION OF MEETING
The meeting terminated at 8.52 pm
ARDS AND NORTH DOWN BOROUGH COUNCIL

A meeting of the Audit Committee was held in the Council Chamber, 2 Church Street, Newtownards on Monday, 25 March 2019 at 7.00 pm.

PRESENT:-

In the Chair: Alderman Irvine

Aldermen: Fletcher
           Gibson
           Keery

Councillors: Armstrong-Cotter
            Dunlop
            Muir

In Attendance: Ms Catriona McHugh – Moore Stephens
               Ms Karen Beattie – NI Audit Office
               Simon McKeown – ASM
               Christine Hagan – ASM

Officers: Chief Executive (S Reid), Director of Finance and Performance (S Christie), Head of Finance (S Grieve), and Democratic Services Officer (E Brown)

1. APOLOGIES

Apologies for inability to attend were received from Councillor Douglas and Alderman Carson.

NOTED.

2. CHAIRMAN’S REMARKS

The Chairman welcomed everyone to the meeting especially the attendees from Moore Stephens (Ms Catriona McHugh), ASM (Mr Simon McKeown and Ms Christine Hagan) and the NIAO (Ms Karen Beattie).

NOTED.

3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

The Chairman asked for any declarations of interest and none were advised.

NOTED.
4. **MEETING WITH NI AUDIT OFFICE AND INTERNAL AUDIT SERVICE IN THE ABSENCE OF MANAGEMENT**

The Chief Executive, Director of Finance and Performance, Head of Finance and Democratic Services Officer all withdrew from the meeting during the discussion of the item (7.03pm – 7.04pm).

**NOTED.**

5. **MATTERS ARISING FROM PREVIOUS MEETING (AUD 02)**

(a) **Audit Committee Minutes dated 17 December 2018**

PREVIOUSLY CIRCULATED: Copy of the above.

Ms Beattie requested if a copy of the draft minutes could be sent to the Audit Office in the future to allow a confirmation for factual accuracy before being presented to the Committee.

The Director of Finance and Performance agreed to facilitate this request.

**AGREED TO RECOMMEND, on the proposal of Alderman Gibson, seconded by Councillor Dunlop, that the minutes be noted.**

(b) **Actions Register**

PREVIOUSLY CIRCULATED: Report from the Director of Finance and Performance stating that in line with best practice, the purpose of the report was to make the Audit Committee aware of the status of outstanding recommendations of any outstanding actions from the previous Audit Committee meetings. It was noted that 9 actions were required from previous committee meetings, these were detailed below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Update</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>January 2018</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 7    | Outstanding External Audit Recommendations | • Clear legacy issues by December 2018  
       |       | • Income policy to be progressed before June audit committee meeting | Head of Finance  
<pre><code>   |       | Dec 2018 | In progress |
</code></pre>
<p>|      |       |        | June 2018   |             |
| 9a   | Single Tender Actions | • Numbers of Direct award contracts to be reported to Committee | Proposed to report these via the Statements of Assurance process. | Complete |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Update</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Draft Financial Statements</td>
<td>• Completion of the Bank reconciliation process for 2017/18 financial year.</td>
<td>Completed up to January 2019</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>December 2018</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Improvement Audit and Assessment</td>
<td>• Internal Audit Plan for 2019/20 to include Performance Improvement as an audit area</td>
<td>Awaiting appointment of new internal auditor in April</td>
<td>In progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Final Audit Letter</td>
<td>• Business Continuity arrangements for Brexit</td>
<td>Reported to CSC January 2019</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9a</td>
<td>Corporate Risk Register</td>
<td>• Health and Safety at Bonfires</td>
<td>Included in Community and Culture Risk register. Included in service plan C&amp;W – March 2019</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9b</td>
<td>Statements of Assurance</td>
<td>• Significant issues from outstanding mid-year statements to be reported</td>
<td>Item 9b</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Internal Audit and Corporate Governance Contract</td>
<td>• Appoint new contractor</td>
<td>Appointment approved at CSC March 2019.</td>
<td>In progress Item 13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RECOMMENDED that the report be noted.

The Director of Finance and Performance reported that the items marked ‘in progress’ would be addressed at either item 7 or 12 on the agenda. All other actions were complete.

Ms Beattie stated that in terms of the improvement audit and assessment and considering whether internal audit would look at that in the future, the timing was important to consider, given that they would be coming in Autumn to do a full assessment. Therefore, the earlier the Council undertook the internal audit work on performance improvement the more added value the Council would get in preparation for the NIAOs full assessment.

The Director responded that he would take that on board. He was mindful of the process around the performance improvement plans and associated work requirements for officers. He stressed that they would engage with Internal Audit and discuss how best they could incorporate those comments.

**AGREED TO RECOMMEND, on the proposal of Councillor Dunlop, seconded by Alderman Keery, that the recommendation be adopted.**
6. **PERFORMANCE IMPROVEMENT PLAN 2018-19 – UPDATE ON KEY ACTIONS (260501)**

(Appendix I)

PREVIOUSLY CIRCULATED: - Report from the Director of Finance and Performance and attaching Audit Committee progress update – Quarter 3 2018-19. The reported stated that the Local Government Act (Northern Ireland) 2014 Part 12 put in place a new framework to support continuous improvement in the delivery of council services. The Council was required each year to determine its priorities for improvement which were aligned to the Community Plan and Corporate Objectives and to publish those in the format of an Improvement Plan.

In the 2018/19 year the Council’s Performance Improvement Plan (PIP) identified 7 improvement objectives with a corresponding 27 actions together with 7 Statutory Indicators, all of which were included in the Council’s Service Plans which were monitored and reported on through each Service’s respective Standing Committee. The following table gave an overall assessment of the status across all actions in the PIP the detail of which could be found in the progress report.

**SUMMARY TABLE OF PROGRESS AGAINST OUR IMPROVEMENT OBJECTIVES FOR Q3 - 2018/19**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Corporate Plan Theme</th>
<th>Improvement Objective</th>
<th>Aggregated RAG Status across all actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PEOPLE</strong></td>
<td>We will support local communities to develop community resilience for emergency planning.</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PLACE</strong></td>
<td>We will increase recycling and divert waste from landfill</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>We will ensure we make the very best of the natural, cultural and environmental assets in our Borough</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>We will improve street cleanliness</td>
<td>☢</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROSPERITY</strong></td>
<td>We will support and invest in our Borough to promote economic growth, regeneration and sustainability</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PERFORMANCE</strong></td>
<td>We will improve customer access to services and functions provided by the Council and improve their efficiency</td>
<td>☢</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>We will reduce staff absence levels across the Council</td>
<td>☢</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OVERALL**

RECOMMENDED that the report be noted.

The Director of Finance and Performance reported that most indicators were marked as green and there were some amber and some red. The report was largely the same as what was reported at the last meeting of the Committee. He invited questions from members however none were raised.

AGREED TO RECOMMEND, on the proposal of Councillor Dunlop, seconded by Alderman Gibson, that the recommendation be adopted.
7ai. OUTSTANDING EXTERNAL AUDIT RECOMMENDATIONS (FIN69) (Appendix II)

PREVIOUSLY CIRCULATED: - Report from the Director of Finance and Performance and attaching External Audit Outstanding Recommendations Register – Version 9. The report detailed that the register of outstanding external audit recommendations had been prepared to align with good practice and to give an appropriate level of priority to those items.

The table below summarised the number of issues where action was outstanding and the appendix provided the detail on each issue.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>March 2018</th>
<th>Changes</th>
<th>March 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Removed</td>
<td>Change Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issued addressed</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue not yet addressed</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long-term project</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RECOMMENDED that the report be noted.

The Director of Finance and Performance reported that four of the outstanding issues had now been addressed and nine were in progress. He was confident that they would continue to progress the implementation of the outstanding recommendations. He invited questions from members however none were raised.

AGREED TO RECOMMEND, on the proposal of Councillor Dunlop, seconded by Councillor Armstrong-Cotter, that the recommendation be adopted.

7aii. UPDATE ON NIAO PERFORMANCE AUDIT RECOMMENDATIONS (Appendix III)

PREVIOUSLY CIRCULATED: - Report from the Director of Finance and Performance and attaching progress update. The report detailed that the Council was aware that the Northern Ireland Audit Office (NIAO) undertook an annual performance audit, to assess how each Council complied with performance improvement duties under the Local Government (Northern Ireland) Act 2014. The 2018/19 audit findings had been previously reported. Those concluded that the Council had discharged its performance improvement and reporting duties and the audit opinion was unqualified.
The report provided an update on any recommendations or suggestions arising, along with same from previous audits that were not fully implemented at the time of the 2018/19 audit. Progress was outlined in the appendix.

RECOMMENDED that the report be noted.

The Director of Finance and Performance advised that this was a new report introduced to consider those recommendations coming from the auditor’s report. A number of the recommendations were marked ‘in progress’ as they would be reflected in the next iteration of the performance improvement plan. He invited questions from members but none were raised.

AGREED TO RECOMMEND, on the proposal of Alderman Gibson, seconded by Alderman Keery, that the recommendation be adopted.

7b. **DRAFT AUDIT STRATEGY**  
(Appendix IV)

PREVIOUSLY CIRCULATED: - Letter and Audit Strategy 2018-19 from the Northern Ireland Audit Office. The letter enclosed the strategy for the audit of the Council’s 2018-19 accounts and the NIAO’s audit and assessment work on the Council’s Performance Improvement arrangements. The Audits would be conducted by ASM. The Audit Strategy provided the Council with an understanding of how the audits would be carried out and the key risks identified in the planning work. Timetables for both aspects of audit work were also included.

RECOMMENDED that the strategy be noted.

Ms Beattie advised that, as she had stated at the previous meeting, the NIAO was changing how it was procuring its contractor to undertake the external work for them and as such ASM had been appointed in January 2019. In the past they had used the contractor to undertake work on the financial audit work but there were two other parts of audit work which they undertook, 1) assessing whether the Council had proper arrangements in place for economy, efficiency and effectiveness and 2) the performance improvement audit and assessment work. That year for the first time the contractors would undertake that work on behalf of the NIAO under its support and monitoring.

In terms of the performance improvement and assessment, Ms Beattie indicated that the Audit would also consider the track record of improvement for the first time which would go back over the last few years to help them assess if the Council was likely to comply with the requirements of the legislation for performance improvement. The NIAO planned to issue its report in November 2019 and that report would report on the Council’s likeliness to comply with legislation up to 31 March 2020.

Also, as part of the performance improvement work the NIAO put out a detailed report at the end of November 2018 which was given to the Department and the Council and on 29 March 2019 the Annual Improvement Report, which was a summary of that report, would be published on the website.
Furthermore, she advised that there had been a reshuffle in the NIAO which meant that this would be her last Audit Committee attendance and she would be replaced by Garrie Currie with Finula Magowan assisting him and she was likely to be at the next Audit Committee meeting to represent the office. She took the opportunity to thank members for their interest and patience.

Ms Hagan stated that ASM was delighted to be appointed to undertake the Council’s audit. She then proceeded to guide members through the Audit Strategy 2018-19 noting the salient points:-

- **Key Messages** – ASM was required to present an audit strategy to members and to highlight members’ responsibilities in receiving the document. The Audit Strategy now included the three aspects of the audit process, providing members with information on the financial statement audit, the proper arrangements audit and the improvement audit.
- **The purpose of the document** was set out in the bullet points on page 3 of the report.
- **One significant audit risk** had been identified, being the valuation, existence, ownership and obsolescence of fixed assets.
- **Proper Arrangements** – they would bring back any results of that proper arrangements work to the Committee to the Report to those charged with Governance
- **Materiality** – that had been calculated at just over £1.2m
- **Actions for the Audit Committee** were on page 5 of the document.
- **Materiality** – in terms of quantitative assessment they were using gross expenditure and they had calculated materiality of 2% of that which equated to £1,275,173.00. They would report all errors greater than £63,750 back to the Committee.
- **Qualitative aspects** – there were a number of areas where they did not look at materiality within the numbers framework and those were the remuneration report, movements on reserves, the legality of expenditure and their audit fee.
- **Audit Approach** – for the financial audit there were four key points which were independence, management of personal data, use of contractors and using the work of Internal Audit.
- **Scope of the audit** – the code of practice drove their audit consideration. The respective responsibilities in the preparation of financial statements rested with management. Proper arrangements and performance improvement were the two additional requirements that ASM would undertake that year.
- **Page 10 of the report** provided further detail regarding identified significant audit risks and highlighted the size of the Council’s estate as a significant risk and also noted the valuation of assets. It also noted the prior year misstatement of the impairment charge on the revaluation of the fixed assets.
- **There had been two key changes** to the code in 2018-19 detailed as IFRS 15 Revenue Recognition and IFRS 9 Financial Instruments, however it was their understanding that there should be no major impact for the Council’s financial statements but if there were any changes that had not been fully implemented they would bring back the results to the Committee.
• There were two audit timetables – one for the financial audit and one for the performance improvement work and all of those times had been agreed with management.

• Audit fees were estimated at £38k for the Council’s statement of accounts, £22k for the performance improvement audit and £1,101 for the National Fraud Initiative work.

• Details of staffing for the audit work and assessment work were presented on pages 17 and 18 respectively.

• Page 20 detailed the prior period misstatements – management had indicated that additional checks would be undertaken to prevent those types of misstatements in that year’s accounts.

Questions were then invited from members.

Alderman Fletcher asked what criteria was used to measure performance and improvement and whether it was purely on a financial situation basis.

In response, Ms Beattie advised that performance was written into the legislation itself and required, for example, the Council to produce a performance improvement plan. She continued that the objectives did not have to be financial and they had to state how the citizens of the Borough would benefit from those. Furthermore, the legislation also required the Council to produce a self-assessment report to see if it had achieved its objectives. The NIAO audit work and assessment was based around whether those documents complied with legislation and whether the arrangements in place were sufficient to comply with the legislative requirements. She explained that this meant the Council would be measured against its own statements about how it was performing.

Referring to materiality, Alderman Fletcher asked how they had arrived at the overall account materiality of 2% and where did they get the 0.1% error reporting threshold.

Ms Beattie explained that materiality in the general auditing sense was a known terminology which expressed an assessment of the amount of error that a reader of the accounts would tolerate. Once it went above that error rate NIAO would deem this to be an unacceptable and could lead to a qualification of the accounts. Generally speaking there was a range within the audit profession for what base was used for materiality. Materiality tended to be between 1-2%.

Alderman Fletcher was of the view that ratepayers would be alarmed at an error level of over £1.2m and he thought the figure was quite high.

Ms Hagan stated that they would report everything greater than £63k in their report and as they moved through the audit any errors they found would be listed and reported back through management. She then said that they would be requesting that management make a decision whether to adjust or not any error between £63k and £1.27m and any errors greater than £1.27m they would be asking management to change or there may be a qualification issue within the accounts if they were not satisfied.
Alderman Fletcher was content to be advised that ASM would be reporting on any errors that the Council made which could be relayed back to the ratepayers.

**AGREED TO RECOMMEND**, on the proposal of Alderman Fletcher, seconded by Alderman Gibson, that the recommendation be adopted.

8. **INTERNAL AUDIT**

(a) **Internal Audit Priority 1 Recommendations Update (AUD03)**  
(Appendix V)

PREVIOUSLY CIRCULATED: - Report from the Director of Finance and Performance and attaching Outstanding Priority 1 Internal Audit Recommendations Register – version 11. The report detailed that the register of outstanding external audit recommendations had been prepared to align with good practice and to give an appropriate level of priority to those items.

The table below summarised the number of issues where action was outstanding and the appendix provided the detail on each issue.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sept 2018</th>
<th>Changes Removed</th>
<th>Change Status</th>
<th>New</th>
<th>March 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Issued addressed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**RECOMMENDED** that the report be noted.

The Director of Finance and Performance stated this was an update on the previous internal audit recommendations and he noted that since the last Committee three more recommendations had been addressed and four were ‘in progress.’ He was confident that they would continue to make progress and implement all recommendations.

In relation to Recommendation 155 report reference 6 on page 3 of the report Councillor Dunlop expressed grave concern that a number of drivers had been removed from driving duties as they had not submitted a valid driving licence and she queried if they were asked to show their driving licence at their interview. She asked how many drivers had been removed from driving. She asked if the refuse truck drivers were driving when their licences were not up to date.

In response, the Head of Finance advised that the driving licences of drivers were now being reviewed every six months by the Transport Manager and that the recommendation had been addressed.

Referring to the six-month check, Alderman Keery advised that the Council already had a system in place that when Councillors claimed mileage allowance, the system highlighted if their licence was due for renewal. He queried why there was no automated system for fleet drivers.
The Head of Finance clarified that those drivers were driving Council vehicles and as such were not submitting mileage claims for use of personal vehicles. He reiterated that the Transport Manager had a process in place to ensure regular checks were completed to ensure that drivers were approved to be driving.

Alderman Keery stated that there was a system in use which indicated when his licence was due for renewal. He said that if they used an automated system it removed the need for a manual check and could be used by anyone employed by the Council.

The Head of Finance stated he would pass on the member’s comments to the Director and Head of Service who could come back to members.

Councillor Armstrong-Cotter stated, as a member of the Environment Committee, that this matter had been discussed in great depth by the Committee after the internal audit had reported the finding and made the recommendation. She was thankful for the report as it showed that the audit system was working in that a risk was identified and there were results of the action being taken. She was not sure why the automated system was not in place but said that the Director of Environment could provide information on that. It was important to note that the system was working in that they were addressing what had been flagged as a major issue and had responded appropriately to it.

Councillor Dunlop sought clarity on the comment that the licence monitoring software had been problematic.

The Head of Finance responded that the recommendation was now noted as complete so he would speak with the Head of Assets and Property Services to contact the member to explain more fully how the system worked.

Alderman Gibson said the report stated that the licences were not valid. He presumed they were valid at some stage or they would not have been allowed to drive. He understood that there was a test provided every year for the same licence holder to increase the safety of the drivers. He stressed that they needed to know the status of licences particularly as it was concerning that a number of drivers did not have a valid licence. He wondered if a change in regulations had played a part in the situation.

The Head of Finance reiterated that the report did not indicate that drivers did not have a valid licence, it was a case of valid licences not having been submitted but that the recommendation had now been addressed.

**AGREED TO RECOMMEND, on the proposal of Alderman Gibson, seconded by Councillor Dunlop, that the recommendation be adopted.**
(b) Recently completed audits:

i. **Partnership Arrangements**  
(Appendix VI)

PREVIOUSLY CIRCULATED:- Copy of the above audit.

Ms McHugh, Moore Stephens provided an overview of the outcome of the audit highlighting that overall a satisfactory assurance had been provided and had two priority 3 findings with associated recommendations.

AGREED TO RECOMMEND, on the proposal of Alderman Fletcher, seconded by Councillor Dunlop, that the information be noted.

ii. **Information Governance and Data Protection**  
(Appendix VII)

PREVIOUSLY CIRCULATED:- Copy of the above audit.

Ms McHugh provided an overview of the outcome of the audit highlighting that overall a satisfactory assurance had been provided and had three priority 3 findings with associated recommendations.

AGREED TO RECOMMEND, on the proposal of Alderman Fletcher, seconded by Councillor Dunlop, that the information be noted.

iii. **Capital Projects**  
(Appendix VIII)

PREVIOUSLY CIRCULATED:- Copy of the above audit.

Ms McHugh provided an overview of the outcome of the audit highlighting that overall a satisfactory assurance had been provided and had one priority 2 finding with associated recommendation. This finding was in relation to the Project Management Handbook being in draft form and the need for the handbook to be finalised and approved with Management accepting the finding.

AGREED TO RECOMMEND, on the proposal of Alderman Fletcher, seconded by Councillor Dunlop, that the information be noted.

iv. **Contract Management and Operations at Exploris**  
(Appendix IX)

PREVIOUSLY CIRCULATED:- Copy of the above audit.

Ms McHugh provided an overview of the outcome of the audit highlighting that overall a satisfactory assurance had been provided and had one priority 3 finding with associated recommendation.
AGREED TO RECOMMEND, on the proposal of Alderman Fletcher, seconded by Councillor Dunlop, that the information be noted.

v. **Tenders and Contracts**  
(Appendix X)

PREVIOUSLY CIRCULATED:- Copy of the above audit.

Ms McHugh provided an overview of the outcome of the audit highlighting that overall a satisfactory assurance had been provided and had one priority 2 finding with associated recommendation. This finding was in relation to supporting the Procurement Service Unit to develop corporate contracting further in order to maximise potential savings with Management accepting the finding.

AGREED TO RECOMMEND, on the proposal of Alderman Fletcher, seconded by Councillor Dunlop, that the information be noted.

vi. **Income and Cash Handling**  
(Appendix XI)

PREVIOUSLY CIRCULATED:- Copy of the above audit.

Ms McHugh provided an overview of the outcome of the audit highlighting that overall a satisfactory assurance had been provided and had four priority 3 findings with associated recommendations.

The Chairman said the report referenced that a cash transaction was changed by hand but there was no explanation as to why it was changed. He presumed that they would highlight that as important that if anyone was doing this that there was a rationale behind why it was done.

Ms McHugh said that was correct and she explained that the recommendation was that if issues were uncovered or changes were manually made that a proper explanation was kept and signed and so that they would know who was making that explanation and why that explanation was needed.

Councillor Dunlop said that the list of income sources did not include the tourist information offices and she sought clarity on that.

In response, the Head of Finance explained that it was just a sample and he confirmed that all sites were tested.

AGREED TO RECOMMEND, on the proposal of Alderman Fletcher, seconded by Councillor Dunlop, that the information be noted.

vii. **Risk Management**  
(Appendix XII)

PREVIOUSLY CIRCULATED:- Copy of the above audit.
Ms McHugh provided an overview of the outcome of the audit highlighting that overall a satisfactory assurance had been provided and had four priority 2 findings with associated recommendations.

She then guided members through the four findings and welcomed questions from members.

On invitation to comment from the Chair of the Committee, the Director of Finance and Performance welcomed the report as risk management and the dedication of an organisation to ensure it managed its risks was very important. He echoed Ms McHugh’s comments that the four priority 2 findings were all interrelated. He said it was about the strategy needing to be reviewed as it had not been reviewed in four years and needed to be developed in consultation with staff and Heads of Service. It was also important to mention that the Head of Service along with her Risk Manager had accepted all the recommendations and had provided implementation dates for delivery.

Alderman Fletcher said he was pleased that all audits had received a satisfactory assurance. He was going to take it as praise that the auditor had found good practice and purported that officers should pass onto staff that they were doing a good job and that this had come from the auditors. He thanked the auditor and hoped that staff appreciated the confidence the auditor had in the Council’s systems.

The Chairman stated it was important that when there was excellence in the workplace that it was recognised and that comments were passed onto staff.

**AGREED TO RECOMMEND, on the proposal of Alderman Fletcher, seconded by Councillor Dunlop, that the information be noted.**

(c) **Annual Internal Audit Report for the Year Ended 31 March 2019**  
(Appendix XIII)

PREVIOUSLY CIRCULATED:- Copy of the above report.

Ms McHugh stated that she was taking the report as read. She advised that they had completed all the assurance audits they had planned for the year in line with the annual internal audit plan which was approved by the Committee in March 2018. As a result of that and as a result of their findings and also because management had accepted all the recommendations and were willing to implement and action them, they were able to give the Council an overall satisfactory assessment for the year.

The Chairman referred to page 4 of the report and sought clarity on the audit area of workforce planning and why it had been postponed.

In reply, Ms McHugh advised that it had been postponed because the focus of Human Resources had been to fill all posts in the new Council which was almost accomplished. She continued that workforce planning was an exercise that Human Resources had put into the future when they would be in that position and so it was not something they could audit at that time but it would be rolled forward into future audit plans.
Alderman Gibson referred to the Council merger of 2015 and he sought clarity on staffing levels then and now in terms of filling posts and the number of posts to be filled.

In response, the Chief Executive explained that the process of the two Councils coming together in respect of staff had allowed for the opportunity for some staff to come forward for voluntary severance. A process had been deployed which was set down by the Department for Communities in terms of how those redundancies would be dealt with. He continued that the time since then had been about establishing and embedding the Council’s Corporate Plan and the way the Council wished to re-prioritise its work. This had a number of associated workforce requirements which required to be addressed and that process had been ongoing. He further stated that a report had been brought to the Corporate Services Committee in recent months about the efficiencies and performance improvements made since 2014/15 which included the benefits to the service users. He indicated he was aware that in the future the audit office planned to report on the efficiencies and improvements that had been derived from the process of the Review of Public Administration.

AGREED TO RECOMMEND, on the proposal of Councillor Dunlop, seconded by Alderman Gibson, that the information be noted.

9. **CORPORATE GOVERNANCE**

9a. *Corporate Risk Register – Update*  
(Appendix XIV)

PREVIOUSLY CIRCULATED: - Report from the Director of Finance and Performance and attaching Corporate Risk Register version 10, December 2018. The report stated that the Corporate Risk Register (CRR) was a live document which was amended as required to reflect new or changing risk factors. The Register had been reviewed by Heads of Service and the Corporate Management Team.

There were no substantive changes. The CRR had been updated to reflect the current status of controls with associated amendment, or adjustment, to Risk evaluations and any further actions required.

**Updates within Version 12, February 2019**

**CR3** Updated to reflect actions now complete. The Grants Policy, the Strategic Medium Term Financial Plan and monitoring of Service Unit budgets were now in place. Progressing the Purchase to Pay system and the roll out of Core 2 had been added as new actions.

**CR5** Review of controls and actions had resulted in a reduction in the perceived Gross and Residual risks. Gross Risk had reduced from 19 to 12 and the Residual Risk from 12 to 9.

**CR6** The Drugs and Alcohol Policy had been developed and now required implementation following the delivery of a training programme.

**CR9** The action on the Corporate Plan had been updated with the process to produce the new plan set to commence Autumn 2019.
The Preferred Actions Paper on the LDP had been produced and would be issued for Public Consultation in March / April 2019.

Departmental Risk Registers had been updated to reflect any perceived risks resulting from Brexit. Emergency Planning and Business Continuity arrangements were being reviewed in light of available information.

RECOMMENDED that the amended Corporate Risk Register be noted.

The Director of Finance and Performance advised that the CRR was there for noting and the summary report highlighted any amendments that had been made since the last meeting.

AGREED TO RECOMMEND, on the proposal of Alderman Keery, seconded by Councillor Dunlop, that the recommendation be adopted.

9b. Statements of Assurance

PREVIOUSLY CIRCULATED: - Report from the Director of Finance stating that in accordance with the Council’s Risk Management Strategy Heads of Service were required to provide Statements of Assurance. Assurance Statements comprised four main sections to be completed by each Head of Service following consultation with each of their Service Units.

Interim Statements of Assurance (period: April 2018 – September 2018) had been reported to the Audit Committee in December 2018. At the time of submission a number of Statements had been outstanding. All outstanding items had been received and this report was confined to the potential issues identified within those Statements.

Findings

General – Identification of Risk, Monitoring and Control measures
Services had confirmed the identification of principal risks and that those risks had associated controls in place. Further action, taken, necessary, new, outstanding or in-progress were confirmed as identified and where appropriate were included within Service Plans.

Section 1 – Strategic and Operational Risk Management
No key issues had been declared as not having appropriate controls in place. All Services had confirmed that any risks identified had appropriate controls and any further actions taken, or to be taken, to adequately mitigate or resolve the risk had been identified.

Section 2 – Internal Control
Generally, there were no key issues arising to cause significant concern requiring immediate action. Progress on Internal Audit findings was reported to the Committee separately although they were reflected in the Assurance Statements. Corporate Communications had advised that the development work on the Social Media Policy (Priority 2 finding) was on-going. As a result, the target completion date had been moved from February 2019 to September 2019. Performance and Projects Service
had similarly advised the need to review completion dates on some outstanding Audit recommendations.

**Section 3 – Governance**
The Planning Service had identified three potential governance issues. 1) On-going major enforcement cases may result in legal costs being incurred. 2) Issues had been identified concerning the replacement of the Planning Portal. Regular updates were provided to the Chief Executive by the Department of Finance via SOLACE and the Planning Portal Governance Board. 3) Issue relating to the NILG Code of Conduct which was being addressed through tailored workshops.

The Leisure and Amenities Service had identified Single Tender actions (>£30k) following from the construction of Ards Blair Mayne Wellbeing and Leisure Centre. These have been reported separately through procurement reports.

**Section 4 – Miscellaneous**
No issues reported.

RECOMMENDED that the report be noted.

The Director of Finance and Performance stated that the report followed on from the December 2018 Committee when at that time not all the Heads of Service interim statements had been received, so this report updated that process. He was pleased to report that all interim statements of assurance had now been received from all Heads of Service and the summary report highlighted anything they felt was worth drawing out from those statements.

Councillor Armstrong-Cotter stated that the Planning section had identified three potential issues one of which was enforcement cases. She assumed that enforcement cases were only taken under the strictest of legal advice and that was the way the Planning section had come to those decisions. She understood that there could be a solicitor at Planning meetings and as such she sought assurance that the Council was adhering to the solicitor’s advice given in those instances.

The Director of Finance and Performance confirmed that was the case.

AGREED TO RECOMMEND, on the proposal of Alderman Fletcher, seconded by Councillor Armstrong-Cotter, that the recommendation be adopted.

**10. MEETING SCHEDULE AND WORK PLAN 2019/20 (AUD02)**

PREVIOUSLY CIRCULATED: - Report from the Director of Finance and Performance providing an update on the above.

**Background**

In order to assist the Committee with its oversight responsibilities a suggested meeting schedule and work plan had been prepared.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting Date</th>
<th>Agenda Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24 June 2019</td>
<td>• Draft Internal Audit Plan for 2019/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Draft Financial Statements and Governance Statement Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Draft External Audit Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Risk Register Update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Statements of Assurance Update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Review of Terms of Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>• Audit Committee Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 September 2019</td>
<td>• Audited Financial Statements Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Draft Report to those charged with Governance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 December 2019</td>
<td>• Final Report to Those charged with Governance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Final Audit Letter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Improvement Audit and Assessment Reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Statements of Assurance Update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 March 2020</td>
<td>• Annual Internal Audit Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Draft Internal Audit Plan for 2020/21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Audit Committee Self-assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Meeting Schedule and work plan 2020/21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition there were standing items on the agenda:

- Declarations of Interest
- Follow-up actions from previous committee meetings
- Outstanding Audit Recommendations Follow-up
- Performance Improvement Progress
- Internal Audit Update
- Single Tender Action Update
- Fraud, whistleblowing and data breaches update

RECOMMENDED that the work plan for the 2019/20 financial year be approved.

AGREED TO RECOMMEND, on the proposal of Alderman Gibson, seconded by Alderman Keery, that the recommendation be adopted.

**EXCLUSION OF PUBLIC/PRESS**

AGREED TO RECOMMEND, on the proposal of Councillor Armstrong-Cotter, seconded by Councillor Dunlop, that the public/press be excluded during the discussion of the undernoted items of confidential business.
11. **SINGLE TENDER ACTIONS UPDATE (231329)**  
(Appendix XV)

***COMMERCIAL IN CONFIDENCE***

***NOT FOR PUBLICATION***

Schedule 6 – Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the Council holding that information).

12. **FRAUD, WHISTLEBLOWING AND DATA-PROTECTION MATTERS – VERBAL UPDATE**

*** IN CONFIDENCE***

***NOT FOR PUBLICATION***

Schedule 6 – Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the Council holding that information).

Ms McHugh withdrew from the meeting.

(Alderman Gibson left the meeting at this stage – 8.05pm)

13. **INTERNAL AUDIT CONTRACT UPDATE – VERBAL UPDATE**

*** IN CONFIDENCE***

***NOT FOR PUBLICATION***

Schedule 6 – Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the Council holding that information).

**RE-ADMITTANCE OF PUBLIC/PRESS**

AGREED TO RECOMMEND, on the proposal of Alderman Keery, seconded by Councillor Dunlop, that the public/press be re-admitted to the meeting.

14. **ANY OTHER NOTIFIED BUSINESS**

a) **Letter from NIAO**

PREVIOUSLY CIRCULATED:- Copy of the above correspondence.

The Chief Executive advised that the letter was in respect of follow up of recommendations for the Local Government Auditor’s Report 2018 which set out broad recommendations. It was there for members information and for noting.
AGREED TO RECOMMEND, on the proposal of Councillor Armstrong-Cotter, seconded by Alderman Keery, that the correspondence be noted.

WORD FROM THE CHAIRMAN

The Chairman wished, as this was the last Committee meeting before the Elections, to place on record his thanks to members for their scrutiny, questions and contribution during the year. He also praised staff for the excellent standard of the reports and he thanked the Chief Executive, Director and Vice Chairman.

TERMINATION OF MEETING

The meeting terminated at 8.10 pm.
ARDS AND NORTH DOWN BOROUGH COUNCIL

A meeting of the Planning Committee was held in the Council Chamber, 2 Church Street, Newtownards on Tuesday, 2 April 2019 at 7.00pm.

PRESENT:

In the Chair: Councillor Cathcart

Aldermen: Carson Girvan
Fletcher McDowell
Graham Henry
Gibson

Councillors: Dunne Thompson
McKee Walker
McIlveen

Officers: Director of Regeneration, Development and Planning (S McCullough), Head of Planning (A McCullough), Principal Planning and Technical Officer (G Kerr), Senior Professional and Technical Officers (P Kerr and A Todd) and Democratic Services Officers (J Glasgow and H Loebnau)

Also in Attendance: S Dickson (Agent)
A Stephens (Agent, Matrix Planning Consultancy)
A Kennedy (Resident, Princetown Road)
G Hamill (Agent)
T Stokes (Agent, TSA Planning)
P O’Rourke (Applicant, Lotus Homes)
C O’Hare (Director of Transport, RPS)
D Donaldson (Agent, Donaldson Planning)

WELCOME

The Chairman welcomed Members and Officers to the meeting and made a special mention of those persons with speaking rights and members of the public seated in the public gallery.

NOTED.

1. APOLOGIES

Apologies for inability to attend were received from Alderman Keery and Councillor McClean. Apologies for lateness were received from Councillor McIlveen.

NOTED.
2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

The Chairman sought Declarations of Interest and none were notified at this stage.

NOTED.

3. MATTERS ARISING FROM MINUTES OF PLANNING
COMMITTEE MEETING OF 5 MARCH 2019

PREVIOUSLY CIRCULATED: - Copy of the above.

RESOLVED, on the proposal of Alderman Gibson, seconded by Alderman Graham, that the minutes be noted.

4. PLANNING APPLICATIONS

4.1. Application Withdrawn

The Chairman informed Members that the application had been withdrawn from the agenda which related to Ballynichol Road, Comber. Further information had been sought at the previous Planning Committee meeting which had since been submitted, altering the previous recommendation, and the application was submitted through the delegated list for approval and no call-in had been received, thus the application had been approved.

NOTED.

4.2 LA06/2018/0030/F – Land 25m East of No 23 Kerrs Road, Bangor
(Appendix I)

PREVIOUSLY CIRCULATED: - Case Officer’s Report.

DEA: Bangor East and Donaghadee
Committee Interest: Called in by Elected Member
Proposal: Existing Agricultural Silo to be enclosed and roofed over to from new agricultural shed and new access lane
Site Location: Land 25m East of No 23 Kerrs Road, Bangor, BT19 7QD
Recommendation: Refuse Planning Permission

The Senior Professional and Technical Officer (P Kerr) outlined the detail of the application which was an application that sought planning permission for an existing agricultural silo to be enclosed and roofed over to from a new agricultural shed and access lane.

The site was located at land 25m East of No.23 Kerrs Road, Bangor and the application was being heard before Committee as it had been called in from the delegated list by Councillor Dunne. There were no public objections to the proposal.
With regard to the Development Plan the site lay in the countryside outside any settlement limit as per the Ards and Down Area Plan 2015. No other designations affected the site.

(Councillor McIlveen entered the meeting – 7.04 pm)

With regard to the SPPS in relation to agricultural development the SPPS provided for development on an active and established agricultural holding where the proposal was necessary for the efficient operation of the holding or enterprise. Within that context Planning Policy Statement 21 (PPS 21) remained the primary policy consideration in assessing the proposal.

With regard to PPS 21, Policies CTY1 and CTY12 were applicable. Policy CTY1 set out the types of development that were considered to be acceptable in the countryside. One of those was ‘agricultural and forestry development’ in accordance with Policy CTY12; therefore, CTY12 was the main policy consideration for the application.

In line with the provision of the SPPS, Policy CTY12 stated that permission would be granted for development where it was demonstrated that it was necessary for the efficient use of the agricultural holding. The first element of the policy being that there must be an active and established holding.

The four main issues that had resulted in a recommendation for refusal were that:

1) There was not currently an existing active and established business. The farm business had only been established in 2017. The business number was allocated in the last 2 years and no additional information had been submitted to demonstrate that the business was currently active and established;

2) The new building was not necessary for the efficient use of the agricultural holding. Regardless of business not being deemed to be active and established, the application had been made out of a desire to have a farm rather than a necessity to house any current livestock - that in itself demonstrated that the proposal was not necessary for efficient use of the holding;

3) There were no exceptional circumstances (or certainly none that had been demonstrated or presented to the Council) that existed to justify an alternative site given that the proposed building was not sited beside existing buildings on the holding (as there were no such buildings); and

4) The building did not fall within agricultural permitted development rights due to the proximity to a third party dwelling and to the fact that there were no other buildings on the holding i.e. it was the first building in the holding and it was more than 75 metres from the nearest part of group of principal farm buildings.

In conclusion there was no established farm business and the building did not meet the parameters of permitted development. The application had been made out of the desire to have a farm rather than any current necessity to house livestock. The onus was on the applicant to demonstrate that the farm had been active and established for 6 years and that had not been possible. It was therefore the
professional planning opinion that the application be refused.

The Chairman highlighted that as Councillor McIlveen entered the meeting during the discussion he was unable to vote. The Chairman invited questions from Members.

Alderman Gibson sought clarification that the buildings located next to the silo on a separate holding, belonging to a relative of the applicant, were an active farm and it was confirmed that they were.

The Chairman invited Mr Stephen Dickson to come forward who was speaking for the application.

Mr Dickson explained that he was representing his client who was unable to attend the meeting. The application sought approval to enclose the existing agricultural silo to include livestock shed, the storage of animal feed, a tractor and a workshop with a new access lane. The background to the application was that the land had been bequeathed to two brothers after their father had died and the application site was acquired by the applicant. He highlighted there was an existing agricultural structure or a building that was specifically built for agricultural purposes. Generally, that type of building was roofed over, the structure was substantial - made up of four rendered block walls, with an access and the silo had a depth of approximately 3m. Mr Dickson stated that the Planning Officers had made a fundamental flaw in the assessment of the application as there was an existing building on site. The applicant lived at 54 Ballyblack Road East, which was approximately 4 miles from the site. The proposal would allow the applicant to maintain and develop the land into a hobby farm starting with the introduction of calves and lambs with future potential for ponies and quad use on the land if the provision was available. Mr Dickson stated that it was an established agricultural structure on the small holding and argued that permitted development rights would apply. The Case Officer’s report confirmed that the proposal would have a low impact on the natural environment. Mr Dickson stressed that there already existed an established agricultural structure on the land so the impact on the natural environment would be minimal. The proposed structure would provide for the welfare of animals by offering protection and storage. In the absence of a structure, the applicant was unable to meet the basic requirements to store farming equipment and to enable the efficient running of a hobby farm.

The Chairman invited questions from Members at this stage.

Alderman Girvan referred to the map showing the site and the footprint of the existing building and sought clarity on a number of matters and was advised that the brother owned the parcel of land under discussion and a parcel at the home farm. He had more than six acres of land in total which met Policy CTY10. It was also explained that there was a family connection to the farm adjacent to the application site.

Alderman Gibson drew attention to the private lane which served the land and it was narrow and bordered by high hedges. The private lane was also shared with the applicant’s uncle who occupied the adjoining farmland.
Alderman Graham sought clarity that the land outlined came to six acres and that that figure excluded the land where the applicant resided.

Alderman Fletcher asked how large the intended structure would be. It was noted that it would be approximately 8 x 16m long and that was small in relation to modern silos. The Alderman noted that it was a large building in a relatively small area.

There were no more questions for the speaker and Mr Dickson returned to the public gallery.

Alderman Graham asked the planners how they would assess the piece of land and if it was considered to be either green field or brown field as a site, he added that agricultural land in the countryside so did not fit easily as either. It was an agricultural structure which had the potential to be roofed over. It was common in the countryside to roof over silos and a way of making them more viable. The Planning Officer explained the land was described as agricultural land in the countryside, and demonstrated the difference between what existed at present and what was proposed via the slides on screen. If the silo had been included as part of the adjoining farm the conversion may have been possible but as the situation stood the proposal constituted development and therefore required planning permission.

Proposed by Alderman Fletcher, seconded by Councillor Walker, that the recommendation be adopted.

On being put to the meeting, with 7 voting FOR, 3 voting AGAINST, 2 ABSTAINING, the recommendation was declared CARRIED. A recorded vote resulted as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FOR (7)</th>
<th>AGAINST (3)</th>
<th>ABSTAINING (2)</th>
<th>ABSENT (2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aldermen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carson</td>
<td></td>
<td>Alderman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fletcher</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gibson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry</td>
<td></td>
<td>Councillor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McDowell</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dunne</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McKee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thompson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Councillor McIlveen was unable to vote

RESOLVED, on the proposal of Alderman Fletcher, seconded by Councillor Walker, that the recommendation be adopted and that planning permission be refused.

4.3 LA06/2018/0617/F – 60 Princetown Road, Bangor (Appendix II)

PREVIOUSLY CIRCULATED:- Case Officer’s Report.
DEA: Bangor Central
Committee Interest: Called in by Elected Member
Proposal: Dwelling with new driveway arrangement
Site Location: 60 Princetown Road, Bangor
Recommendation: Grant Planning Permission

The Senior Professional and Technical Officer (A Todd) outlined the detail of the application which was for a dwelling with a new driveway arrangement at 60 Princetown Road, Bangor. The application had been brought before the Planning Committee following a call-in request by Alderman Graham to allow further consideration of the proposal with regard to height, massing, dominance and the impact on the amenity of 58A Princetown Rd.

The site was located on Princetown Road in Bangor just north-west of Bangor town centre. The site was also within the proposed Bangor West Area of Townscape Character as set out in the Draft Belfast Metropolitan Area Plan.

Princetown Road was an attractive, long established residential area featuring mainly large dwellings within generous plots. The proposed dwelling would be sited in a section of the front garden and driveway area of No. 60. The proposal would replicate the established pattern of development along that side of the road which was characterised by two rows of buildings, one facing out towards the coast and one fronting onto Princetown Road. The buildings were quite substantial in terms of height and size.

The Officer showed views of the site from Princetown Road with the existing dwelling at 58a to the south and 60a to the north so the proposed dwelling would sit in the gap in the frontage.

A plan showed the previous outline planning permission granted by the Council in February 2017 for a dwelling on the site. This permission remained extant until 23rd February 2020. It was noted that the current proposal repositions the proposed dwelling further away from No. 58a so that it did not sit immediately opposite the full extent of the side elevation of 58.

The footprint, massing and height of the proposed dwelling was comparable with the existing adjacent buildings. The elevations of the proposed dwelling were shown in relation to the existing dwellings. The dwelling would be a split level design, two storey to the front and three storey to the rear. The front elevation would have a height of 6.9m to the ridge which was considered to be modest and would not result in a prominent or obtrusive feature in the street scene. That would sit 0.8m below the ridge height of 60a to the north. The proposed dwelling would be higher than the ridge height of 58a, however 58a was very much an exception along Princetown Road sitting much lower down in its site than all of the other properties.

The planning history of the site was a material consideration. Full permission was originally granted for a dwelling on the site on 13 June 2011 followed by the outline planning permission which was granted by the Council on 24 February 2017.
Another image showed the outline of the dwelling approved under the full permission W/2010/0579/F granted in June 2011. The ridge height of that dwelling was approved at 8.7m, considerably higher than the 6.9m currently proposed. The more recent outline permission also allowed for a higher dwelling on the site as it included a condition stipulating that the ridge height of the dwelling must be no higher than that of 60a Princetown Road which would allow for a maximum ridge height of 7.7m.

The current proposal was therefore considered to be a betterment when compared to both of those previous permissions given its significantly lower ridge height and improved positioning further away from 58a.

Although the current application represented a betterment, three letters of objection were still received from the occupants of 58 and 58a Princetown Road. The residents of both properties raised concerns in relation to the size, scale and dominance of the proposal, its impact on nearby listed buildings and on the amenity of their dwellings.

Historic Environment Division was consulted in respect of the potential impact of the development upon listed buildings and did not raise any objections.

With regard to impact on No. 58, the proposed dwelling would be situated at least 24m away and would not result in any greater degree of overlooking than that already experienced from 58a.

In terms of the potential impact on 58a there would be no loss of privacy as the only upper floor windows proposed on the side elevation facing 58a would be a bathroom window and a secondary living area window. It was recommended that both of those windows were subject to a condition requiring obscure glazing to be fitted prior to occupation.

By way of potential loss of light, 58a had four ground floor windows on its north western elevation serving kitchen and living areas. The approximate location of those windows was shown in red on the site layout plan. It was a material consideration that none of those windows was the sole source of light to the rooms each served. The utility room had another window to the front elevation. The living area had another window to the rear elevation and the kitchen extended into a dining area which had windows along the opposite side elevation. All of those windows already looked out onto an existing boundary wall and fence and it was not considered that the erection of the proposed dwelling would result in a significantly greater impact on the amount of light to those rooms. In addition, as the proposed dwelling would not extend the full length of 58a’s side elevation, daylight would still be achievable from the rear. The proposed light-coloured render finish of the dwelling would also help to reflect light towards 58a which was a mitigation measure recommended in the Building Research Establishment’s Daylight and Sunlight Good Practice Guide.

Summarising the Officer stated that the proposal was not considered to result in an unacceptable adverse impact which would warrant refusal of planning permission. As outlined, the planning history of the site was a material consideration. Outline planning permission for a dwelling on the site remained extant until February 2020,
meaning that Reserved Matters for a dwelling with a height of 7.7m could be submitted for approval. The current proposal with a height of 6.9m and a position on the site further away from 58a actually represented a betterment in terms of a reduced impact on the existing property. On that basis it was recommended that full planning permission should be granted.

Members were invited to ask questions and Councillor Walker referred to the previous outline planning permission which had been be granted and questioned why the changes had been made. The Planning Officer advised that the current application was for a smaller building, the layout was different and the footprint was reduced and that was possibly the reasoning for a full application being submitted rather than a reserved matters application. The changes had not been requested by Council.

Alderman Graham referred to the ridge height of over 7m and the Officer explained that the outline planning application had a condition that stipulated that the ridge height should be no higher than that at 60a. She further explained that the application pushed the dwelling forward and the side elevation was no longer obstructed. The render on the building would be white to reflect light and the Alderman asked if that could be stipulated as a planning condition. The Officer stated that a planning condition could be added if the Committee felt it was necessary.

The Chairman invited Andy Stephens and Anne Kennedy to come forward who were speaking against the application.

Mrs Anne Kennedy explained that her elderly parents lived in number 58a and she herself lived in number 58 Princetown Road. She was representing the concerns of her parents. They were not objecting to a further building but rather the size, scale and proximity of it to her parents’ home which would currently have a detrimental impact in that it would dominate their only private amenity space. The planning considerations had failed to consider the differences in levels of 2.5m and the resulting impact on the residential amenity. Mrs Kennedy considered that the application would have an adverse impact on the residential amenity by way of dominance and loss of light. The proposal would impinge upon the patio area which was the only private amenity space and that would be dominated by the gable wall of the proposal. The proposed gable would extend 9m in height above the patio and 1.25m from the boundary. Mrs Kennedy stated that would be an unreasonable loss of light, that would not meet the 25% light test and the light would be significantly curtailed in the ambient sky light within the interior kitchen. The proposal at 58a had been reduced at the time from 2 storey to 1 ½ storey to reduce impact by way of dominance of overlooking. Mrs Kennedy stated that Planning Policy existed to protect and safeguard amenity and on this occasion she felt planning policy had failed to protect neighbouring properties. Mrs Kennedy asked the Committee to consider deferring the application for a site visit to gain an understanding in the difference in the levels as it was difficult to appreciate the dominance from the drawings alone.
The Planning Officer had explained the separation distances of 4.25m and the 25 degree light test but it should be noted that the building had windows on different elevations and was served by light from many windows.

Mr Stephens then informed Members that while the history and decisions made about the site were a material planning consideration Council was not bound by the decisions of central government and its decisions should not be fettered by previous decisions since only court decisions were binding. Indeed, that previous permission had been granted in 2010 by the Department of the Environment and was for outline planning permission and had not included sectional drawings therefore the difference in levels between the proposal and 58a was not clearly stated. The amenity currently enjoyed by 58a was also a material consideration since it was not being safeguarded as the scale and mass of the proposal was so dominant.

Members were invited to ask questions and Councillor McIlveen referred Mrs Kennedy and Mr Stephens to the extant planning permission which was for a bigger building and asked would that not have a greater detrimental impact on her parents’ property.

In response it was noted that the extant permission was for outline planning permission and there had not been detail in the application in relation to the building layout drawings and segregation plans. It was noted that her parents’ amenity space was 2.5m below the adjoining site.

Alderman Graham explained that the objectors were not against the principle of a house but it was the dominance that was the problem with the current proposal. He asked them what in their opinion would be an acceptable height. It was their opinion that the heights of the buildings should reflect the drop in the road but the 9m ridge height was viewed to be unacceptable.

Alderman Girvan agreed that the new building did look like it would overbear number 58a and lead to a loss of light and privacy particularly in its external space.

As Members had no more questions, Mr Stephens and Mrs Kennedy returned to the public gallery.

Gerry Hamill was invited to speak for the application and he stated that the proposal did meet with the guidelines set. A design for a larger home had been agreed previously, and the new application was of a reduced scale, size and footprint. A hipped roof also permitted additional light and the boundaries had been increased. The upper windows would be obscured to protect privacy and there would be additional planting carried out at the driveway. The medical condition of his client required the home to improve quality of life for the individual while respecting the general area and existing dwellings.

Alderman Graham referred to the height of the proposed building and it was stated that a higher building of 7.2m had been passed but that had been reduced to 6.9m. The height from ground level to gutter was 5m.
Councillor Walker asked why changes had been made to the existing approval and in response it was explained that it fitted the design brief better and the decision to hip the roof respected the contours of the site better. The boundary would be secured with a 2.5m fence. The Member asked if the neighbours had been consulted however 58a was unusual in the development in that it was set lower in the site.

Alderman McDowell asked for an indication of where North was on the plan in relation to site 58a since the pattern of the sun would affect the property.

Councillor McIlveen considered that there would be some dominance. The Planning Officer stated that the pattern of the sun had been considered. The patio of the property at number 58a would continue to benefit from direct sunlight for most of the day. However, that needed to be balanced by the extent on the immediate aspect and the feeling of being hemmed in that the property owner may feel.

Proposed by Councillor Walker, seconded by Councillor McKee, that the Planning Officer’s recommendation be adopted.

Councillor McIlveen did not agree with the recommendation and affirmed that he would not like to live with a dominant building beside him. Alderman Girvan agreed and felt that the only way to appreciate the degree of dominance would be for a site visit to take place.

On the Officer’s recommendation being put to the meeting, with 4 voting FOR, 7 voting AGAINST and 2 ABSTAINING the proposal was declared LOST. A recorded vote resulted as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FOR (4)</th>
<th>AGAINST (7)</th>
<th>ABSTAINING (2)</th>
<th>ABSENT (2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aldermen</strong></td>
<td><strong>Aldermen</strong></td>
<td><strong>Alderman</strong></td>
<td><strong>Alderman</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carson</td>
<td>Fletcher</td>
<td>Gibson</td>
<td>Keery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McDowell</td>
<td>Girvan</td>
<td>Councillor</td>
<td>Councillor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Councillors</strong></td>
<td><strong>Councillors</strong></td>
<td><strong>Councillors</strong></td>
<td><strong>Councillors</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McKee</td>
<td>Graham</td>
<td>Dunne</td>
<td>McClean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walker</td>
<td>Henry</td>
<td>Mcllveen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Thompson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Alderman Girvan suggested that a site visit be arranged and Members were reminded that the next meeting of the Planning Committee would take place in June and a new committee would be appointed before then. The Alderman suggested that an emergency meeting could be arranged if that was possible and that she could not support the recommendation until she had visited the site for herself.

Alderman Graham felt that a drop of 2.5m was quite large and therefore made the building significant in being dominant.

Councillor Walker had no difficulty with the desire for a site meeting however he believed that it was putting off the inevitable decision which needed to be made.
that if the application were to come to the Planning Committee in June it may need to be heard again.

Under the circumstances it was considered important to try to resolve the issue before the new Council was formed. Members had a moral obligation to the applicant to make a decision.

RESOLVED, on the proposal of Alderman Girvan, seconded by Councillor McIlveen, that a decision on the application be deferred until a site visit had taken place.

(Alderman Carson withdrew from the meeting - 8.21 pm)

4.4. **LA06/2018/0610/F - Lands Zoned for Housing fronting Ballygowan Road adjacent and North East of No. 8 Clattering Ford, approximately 100m North West of Nos 7 to 21 (odds) The Mill Stream and 50m South West of Andrews Memorial Primary School, Comber**

(PAper III)

PREVIOUSLY CIRCULATED:- Case Officer’s Report.

**DEA:** Comber

**Committee Interest:** Major Planning Application

**Proposal:** Lands Zoned for Housing fronting Ballygowan Road adjacent and North East of No. 8 Clattering Ford, approximately 100m North West of Nos 7 to 21 (odds) The Mill Stream and 50m South West of Andrews Memorial Primary School, Comber

**Site Location:** Land Zoned for Housing fronting Ballygowan Road adjacent and North East of No 8 Clattering Ford, approximately 100m North West of Nos 7 to 21 (odds) The Mill Stream and 50m South East of Andrews Memorial Primary School, Comber

**Recommendation:** Grant Planning Permission

The Principal Planning and Technical Officer (G Kerr) outlined the detail of the application which was an application for full planning permission for 70 dwellings of which 36 were detached and 34 semi-detached garages with open space, landscaping, landscaping buffer and associated site and access works. The site was located within the development limit of Comber on the south western entrance approach to the town along the Ballygowan Road, and at the junction of Clattering Ford. The Ballycreely and Rush River bounded the southern and south eastern portion of the site. There was also an attractive wooded river corridor which provided a back drop to the site when viewed from the Ballygowan Road.

The proposal formed residential development for housing zoning – CR 04 – which was zoned in the Ards and Down Area Plan. The overall zoning was approximately 4.17 hectares. The site lay just inside the development limit for Comber directly adjacent to a Local Landscape Policy Area the countryside. Key site considerations listed in the area plan had been adhered to such as density, access arrangements and dwelling layout and design, provision of a landscape buffer, a footpath along Ballygowan Road at the site frontage with a right hand turning lane for traffic travelling from Ballygowan to gain access to the site and the protection of natural
and built heritage in the area. It should also be noted that land set aside for the Comber bypass was not affected by this application.

In line with legislation for a major application, a pre-application consultation event was held in Comber on 26th April 2018 where clarification was provided to those attending the event. It was reflective of the quality design of the development that no specific changes were required to the proposal. Clarification was offered regarding issues such as the surrounding high quality wildlife and traffic issues. Those issues had been fully addressed by the applicant and considered in the Case Officer’s report. Public and private open space within the proposal had been assessed and it was considered proposed open space and landscaped areas would break up the overall built form and be further enhanced by extra planting throughout. Scale, massing and design had been assessed and found acceptable and would ensure development respects the site at its edge of the development limit abutting the countryside setting. Separation distances had been assessed and were found to be acceptable. Furthermore, the separation distances proposed would ensure no unacceptable adverse impact on residential amenity in terms of overlooking, dominance, noise, and overshadowing.

A range of consultations took place on the proposal and no objections were raised, subject to inclusion of appropriate conditions. An updated response had been provided from Rivers Agency and SES with regards to a revised flood risk and drainage assessment and both consultees have no objection to the proposal. There was a total of eight objections covering a range of material issues including the requirement for housing, visual impact, density, traffic and impact on wildlife. All material issues had all been considered within the Case Officer’s report.

In summary, the application site was zoned for housing in the local development plan and it was the professional planning judgement that the proposal complied with prevailing policy and guidance which was considered to provide a quality and sustainable residential environment and was recommended for approval.

The Chairman invited questions from Members.

Alderman Girvan sought clarity that the development of phase 3 of the Comber bypass would not be affected. The Principal Planning and Technical Officer displayed the visual and explained that phase 3 of the Comber bypass was outside of the development. That was a key consideration in the area plan, that land was protected and DfI Roads were consulted on the application.

Alderman Girvan stated that she did have concerns regarding the 1300 houses that were planned for Comber over the next 5 – 8 years. She referred to housing developments at Enler, Bridge Street, Ardnvally and another application was in the system for a development on the Killinchy Road. Alderman Girvan was concerned that the infrastructure was not available to support the extent of the new houses, along with doctors, schools, sewerage and drainage systems. She highlighted the congestion in Comber already and this development would add approximately a further 100 cars to the area. Comber was a dormitory town leading into Belfast and Alderman Girvan questioned if the aforementioned matters had been taken into consideration.
The Officer explained the land had been zoned in the local area plan and those issues such as infrastructure would have been taken into account in the preparation of the plan. There were long-term plans for the creation of the by-pass. Extensive consultation would have been carried out during the preparation of the development plan and if the land was not suitable it would not have been zoned. The Officer explained that the public event for the development was not a negative experience with attendees being in favour of the development. It was a plan led system and a presumption in favour of development.

Alderman Girvan felt that was a valued judgement made by those who did not necessarily live in the town. She wished it to be recorded that the town of Comber was becoming very congested and looking to the future she wondered how it would pan out.

Alderman McDowell referred to the railway embankment and questioned if that would be impeded. He also raised questions regarding the open space and if there was any planning gain from, the development for the people of Comber. The Officer explained that the railway embankment was protected as part of the overall strategy for the Borough. The site utilised the best features, there was a river corridor with a good band of trees which would be utilised as a public walkway with railings for the protection of the young people and a gate for access. The development was considered to be a betterment for Comber, the people who grew up in Comber wanted to remain in Comber and feedback from the public engagement event was that it was a welcomed development.

The Chairman invited Tom Stokes (Agent, TSA Planning), Paul O’Rourke (Applicant, Lotus Homes) and Conor O’Hare (Director of Transport, RPS) to come forward who were speaking for the application.

Mr Stokes outlined that the scheme comprised 70 new family homes at lands zoned for housing known as CR04. A detailed community consultation exercise was undertaken and was well attended by more than 80 people and generally the feedback from that event was very positive. Lotus Homes had won Residential Development of the Year for the past 4 years in Northern Ireland. Detailed discussions had occurred with Planning Officers which he believed helped inform the quality scheme that had been put forward. As well as delivering family homes, the proposal included a riverside walkway and landscaped area with the retention of the mature trees. All the properties had in-curtilage car parking and the density of the scheme was slightly lower than that recommended in the area plan. Furthermore, Mr Stokes outlined that a new right hand turn lane would be installed from the Ballygowan Road and there would also be a 20m wayleave which had been discussed with DfI Roads and deemed more than a sufficient quantum of land for the future road link. Mr Stokes asked Members to consider a number of key factors in their consideration of the application,

- The principal of establishment by virtue of zoning within the plan
- The scheme offered a variety of housing both semi detached, detached, 3, and 4 bedroom properties
- The open space had been designed to incorporate a riverside walkway which was considered important by the local community at the consultation event
• Generous gardens had been provided for each house
• All of the statutory consultees responded with no objections to the proposal.

The application brought a high quality residential development and represented a significant investment by Lotus Homes into the Borough of in and around £12m and would create around 50 construction jobs. Mr Stokes stated that if planning permission was approved, works could commence on site in a matter of weeks. Mr Stokes requested that Members endorse the Officer’s recommendation of approval.

In response to Members questions, Mr Stokes added that the large green open space had been identified and in conjunction with the residents at the consultation it was felt that was a key asset of the site and the proposal sought to enhance that area. In terms of the bypass, as stated a 20m wayleave had been included in order to protect the road line. With regards to traffic, Mr Stokes stated that a new access lane had been created onto the Ballygowan Road, allowing traffic to free flow and provide a right hand turn movement into the site.

The Chairman invited questions from Members.

Alderman Girvan stated that the plan was attractive and well laid out however she was concerned regarding traffic congestion. She wondered if it would be the intention to inform new homeowners that there was a future proposal for a bypass beside the houses. Mr Stokes stated that they had tried to be as open and transparent as possible in all of the plans that had been submitted. The plan would illustrate to potential purchasers that there was a new bypass planned at some point in the future.

Alderman Gibson asked if there was a buffer between the houses and the walkway. Mr Stokes explained the design of dwellings would be to overlook the Riverside walkway and there would be a roadway between the dwellings. The edge of the walkway would have a black estate rail and planting to integrate the walkway into the existing landscape while keeping it separate from the properties.

Alderman Graham raised a question regarding maintaining the existing natural amenities. Mr Stokes stated that it would not be normal practice to light up the open space however the public road would have street lighting which would light up the area.

Councillor Thompson referred to the landscape management plan for the green space and noted in the Officer’s report that it stated that any changes or alterations to the approved landscape management arrangements should be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Council. Councillor Thompson expressed concern that after a period the Council would have to look after the green space, he noted that had occurred in other areas and he sought assurances in that regard. Mr O’Rourke explained that Lotus Homes always formed a management company to which every purchaser would become a shareholder.

Councillor Thompson worried about the future when the landscape company disappeared and wondered what might happen then. Mr O’Rourke reiterated that
the purchasers would have a share of that area and the responsibility would not fall to the Council.

UNANIMOUSLY RESOLVED, on the proposal of Councillor McIlveen, seconded by Alderman Fletcher, that the recommendation be adopted and that planning permission be granted.

4.5. **LA06/2015/0848/F** - Lands approximately 70m South of 48 Glen Road, Holywood

(Appendices IV - XI)

PREVIOUSLY CIRCULATED:- 3rd Addendum, Solicitor’s letter and updated Habitats Regulations Assessment, Case Officer Report presented September 2017, 1st Addendum to Case Officer Report April 2018, 2nd Addendum to Case Officer Report April 2018, Extract from Planning Committee minutes September 2017 and Extract from Planning Committee minutes April 2018.

**DEA:** Holywood and Clandeboye

**Committee Interest:** A delegated application called-in by Planning Committee

**Proposal:** New detached dwelling with double garage and boundary wall with all associated site works

**Site Location:** Lands approximately 70m South of 48 Glen Road, Holywood, BT18 0HB

**Recommendation:** Grant Planning Permission

The Chairman highlighted to the Committee that only those Members who were present for the consideration of the proposal at the meeting on 10th April were eligible to take part in the discussion and vote on the application, therefore Councillor McKee was excluded.

(Councillor McKee withdrew from the meeting – 8.50 pm)

The Principal Planning and Technical Officer (G Kerr) outlined the detail of the application which sought a detached dwelling, double garage and boundary wall on lands approximately 70m south of 48 Glen Road, Holywood.

Members would recall that the application was previously presented to the Planning Committee on 5th September 2017 and 10 April 2018.

The application had to be heard afresh in April 2018 since, following the September meeting and prior to the issue of the decision, further objection and additional letters were submitted on behalf of the objector who was the owner of No 42 Glen Road.

Those matters related to drainage connection proposals and impact on sensitive designated sites; impact on other natural heritage interests including bats; assessment of the application under the Draft Belfast Metropolitan Area Plan (BMAP); impact of the proposal on the residential amenity of the adjacent approved dwelling; intensification within the proposed Area of Townscape Character (ATC) and Japanese Knotweed.
A Biodiversity checklist and bat roost potential survey was also submitted to address third party concerns and an addendum was prepared and had to be brought back for discussion to be heard afresh in April 2018.

At both meetings the Committee was unanimous in their decision to approve.

Further to that, the objector submitted a further objection specifically in relation to the Councils’ assessment of the application under the Habitats Regulations.

Correspondence was also received from Alex Easton MLA on behalf of the objector raising the issue of potential overlooking into No.42 Glen Road.

As it had been considered that new material considerations were raised after the passing of the original resolution by the Planning Committee it was therefore appropriate to return the proposal to Planning Committee. However, it should be noted that the original application had already been agreed by Committee so the focus was on the additional matters raised and detailed in the 3rd addendum. The agent acting on behalf of the applicant was present to answer any further questions.

The Planning Officer showed the site of the proposal on slides to remind Members of the application.

One of the additional issues raised from the objector was in relation to the assessment of the impact of the proposal on the designated sites of Belfast Lough. It was contended that in the absence of plans which specifically identified current drainage from the site (including any nearby watercourses) and proposed drainage from the site, the Council’s duties under Regulation 43 of the Habitats Regulations could not be met.

Consultee Shared Environmental Service reviewed the third party objection and carried out an updated Habitats Regulation Assessment (HRA) on behalf of the Council to consider the potential effects of the proposal on European designated sites.

The updated HRA stated that considering the distance and nature/scale of the intervening land buffer, which would attenuate and disperse any contaminated run off, it was considered unlikely that contaminated surface waters, generated via the construction phase, could significantly affect the nature conservation features of the designated site and/or supporting habitats. In addition, the HRA noted that a wall bounded the southern perimeter of the development which would further contain potential contaminants.

The HRA pointed to a number of surface drains adjacent to the application site and highlighted that there was uncertainty as to the eventual outfall location(s) of those features. If a precautionary approach was adopted the HRA stated that there was potential for construction related pollutants to migrate off-site via the drainage network and impact Belfast Lough and associated designated sites.

However, the HRA noted that the proposal was located within an already built environment and that new/additional disturbance of site features was unlikely. It was also noted that the Statutory Nature Conservation Body (NIEA Marine Division and Natural Environment Division) did not raise any concerns following consultation.
The HRA also noted that NIEA Water Management Unit was content with the proposal on the basis that foul sewerage infrastructure from the development connected to the main Northern Ireland Water foul sewer which terminated at Seahill Waste Water Treatment Works. Northern Ireland Water confirmed that the WWTW had capacity to serve the proposal.

Given that the direction and discharge of private storm drainage adjacent to the site was not currently known, an Environmental Construction Management and Pollution Prevention Plan was prepared on behalf of the applicant to mitigate against any potential impact of surface water run-off during the construction phase of the development.

The Plan sought to ensure that surface water run-off during the construction process would be mitigated against and managed within the bounds of the application site through introduction of straw bale sediment barriers and cut-off ditches lined with geotextile oil and sediment control membrane.

Shared Environmental Service concluded that having considered the nature, scale and location of the project, and provided that any planning approval was conditioned to ensure mitigation outlined in the ECMPPP was implemented, the proposal would not have an adverse effect on site integrity of any European designated site.

DAERA’s Marine and Fisheries Division and Natural Environment Division reviewed the ECMPPP and provided no additional comment.

The third-party objector also contended that the Council must require the applicant to provide adequate drainage plans to inform a robust assessment of the application.

The proposal for a single dwelling did not exceed any of the thresholds requiring a drainage assessment.

A history of surface water flooding on the application site had not been recorded on the Rivers Agency Flood Map. The ECMPPP would ensure that surface water run-off could be contained within the bounds of the application site during the construction process. Statutory consultees had reviewed the supporting information and provided no objection to the proposal in relation to the impact on sensitive designated sites or other natural heritage interests. On this basis it was considered that a Drainage Assessment under Policy FLD3 was not required.

The main Development Management Report stated that ‘the location of the proposed dwelling, separation distances between it and existing dwellings and the orientation of windows would ensure there was no overlooking, loss of light, overshadowing or other adverse impact on neighbouring properties.’ As discussed in detail in the first addendum to the main report the assessment was also relevant to the adjacent building that had extant planning permission for conversion to a dwelling.

A separation distance of approximately 18.5m would be provided between the closest point of the single storey annex of the objector’s dwelling at No. 42 Glen Road and the single storey annex of the proposed dwelling. A greater separation
distance of approximately 33m would be provided between the first floor windows on the north-west elevation of the proposed dwelling and the main south east elevation of the existing dwelling. It was considered that those separation distances were sufficient to ensure that the degree of overlooking between the proposed dwelling and No.42 Glen Road would not be unacceptably adverse. An approximately 2.5m high existing red brick wall beyond the north-west boundary of the site would help further minimise potential overlooking between the proposed dwelling and the objector’s property.

It remained the professional planning judgement that the separation distances provided were sufficient to ensure that there would be no unacceptable adverse impact on existing or proposed residential amenity in terms of loss of light, overshadowing, dominance or any other disturbance.

Having reconsidered the application in light of the additional objection received and updated consultation responses from statutory consultees it was considered that the recommendation to grant planning permission should remain unchanged subject to conditions.

The Chairman invited questions from Members.

Councillor McIlveen sought clarity in respect of the last time that application was brought before Committee and recalled at the last meeting TLT Solicitors had presented on the application and the issue of Habitats had been raised. Councillor McIlveen asked what new factors had been brought to light to require reconsideration of the application. The Head of Planning stated that Andrew Ryan, TLT Solicitors had been in attendance at the last meeting on behalf of the objector. The objectors complaint queried the SES response in respect of the underground drainage structure and what potential hydrological link there could be into the lough. The objector continued to argue that there were underground drainage structures where the output was unknown and the application could not lawfully proceed on that basis. The application had been discussed with the legal team and under case law and to ensure a robust assessment of the proposal that the application was brought back to the Committee.

Alderman Fletcher wondered how much longer the Planning Office could continue to receive additional information and thought there should be stage were a line could be drawn. The Head of Planning stated that the process had been laborious but that it was important to ensure that any decision reached was robust. She explained that if Planning Officers were in receipt of a new material consideration or there had been doubt cast on previous considerations of the application, that must be taken into account. However, if the Committee was minded to approve the application a decision notice would be issued promptly.

**RECESS**

At this stage, 9.02 pm the meeting adjourned for a 10 minute comfort break.

(Councillor Dunne withdrew from the meeting at this stage – 9.02 pm)
The Chairman invited David Donaldson to come forward who was speaking for the application.

Mr Donaldson highlighted that the application had been submitted in November 2015 and the matter had now been ongoing for 3 ½ years. The applicant had gone to the expense of undertaking a bio-diversity check list. The application had been signed off by the NIEA and the Shared Environmental Service and no adverse impact had been identified. Mr Donaldson asked the Committee to respectfully endorse the Officers recommendation.

Proposed by Alderman Fletcher, seconded by Alderman Graham, that the recommendation be adopted and that planning permission be granted.

Councillor McIlveen asked if Officers were satisfied all that could be done had been and this would be the final recommendation. The Head of Planning stated that Officers could not predict if further information would be presented, however assured Members that the application had been explored fully.

UNANIMOUSLY RESOLVED, that the recommendation be adopted and that planning permission be granted.

5. UPDATE ON PLANNING APPEALS
(Appendices XII)

PREVIOUSLY CIRCULATED:- Report dated 2 April 2019 from the Director of Regeneration, Development and Planning providing members with an update on a number of Planning Appeals.

The following appeal was dismissed on 11 March 2019:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appeal Reference</th>
<th>2018/A0120</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Application Reference</td>
<td>LA06/2018/0214/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appeal by</td>
<td>Mr David McCullough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject of Appeal</td>
<td>Refusal of advertising consent for Replacement section of signage to be a digital illuminated board with moving image text, fixed directly to the existing painted timber signs board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Nos. 19-21 Bridge Street, Bangor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Council had refused advertising consent on 4 July 2018 for three reasons:

i. The proposal was contrary to Policy AD1 Amenity and Public Safety of PPS17: Control of Outdoor Advertisements, in that it does not respect the amenity of the area by reason of its general appearance, dominant siting, scale and use of non-traditional materials of the signage in relation to the scale and characteristics of the surrounding area;

ii. The proposal was contrary to Policy BH Development affecting the Setting of the Listed Building of PPS6: Planning, Archaeology and the Built Heritage
and para 6.12 of the SPPS, in that an electronic sign of this nature detracts from, and does not respect the character and the setting of two nearby listed buildings; and

iii. The proposal was contrary to Policy ATC 3 – The Control of Advertisements in an Area of Townscape Character of the addendum to PPS6: Areas of Townscape Character in that an electronic sign of this nature detracts from, and does not respect the character and appearance of the host building and surrounding area due to the design, scale and the non-traditional materials utilised, with the signage having a significant impact on the street scene.

The Commissioner upheld the first two of the Council’s reasons dismissing the appellant’s arguments regarding the viability of his business and continued investment in his home town as being insufficient to outweigh the harm to visual amenity and the setting of the listed building. She further dismissed his argument regarding the illumination of the McKee Clock as being on all fours with the appeal.

The PAC issued decisions on the following two appeals which were latterly heard concurrently on 15 August 2018.

On concerned an appeal against the Council’s part refusal of a Certificate of Lawfulness for a livery use, and the other an appeal an Enforcement Notice for an alleged unauthorised dwelling, both at the same site.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appeal Reference</th>
<th>2017/E0049</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Application Reference</td>
<td>LA06/2017/1354/LDE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appeal by</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs Gary Howell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject of Appeal</td>
<td>The refusal in part of an application for a Certificate of Lawfulness of Existing Use or Development for the following: Livery Business – includes 12no. stables over 5 structures, tack room and sand exercising paddock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Glenairley Stables, 283 Killaughey Road, Donaghadee</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appeal Reference</th>
<th>2015/E0047</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Application Reference</td>
<td>X/2014/0065/CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appeal by</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs Gary Howell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject to Appeal</td>
<td>Alleged unauthorised dwelling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Land at 283 Killaughey Road, Donaghadee</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On 22 January 2016 the Council served an Enforcement Notice on an authorised dwelling at 283 Killaughey Road which was constructed without planning permission. The Notice was appealed with the grounds of appeal including ground (a) ‘deemed application’ for the dwelling as built. The PAC issued its decision in this appeal on 27 July 2017, granted the dwelling under Policy CTY6 of PPS21 under ‘domestic and personal circumstances; however, the Council successfully challenged this decision through the High Court which resulted in the decision being quashed on 11 September 2017 and remitted to the Commission for redetermination.

Prior to the decision being retaken, the appellant submitted a Certificate of Lawfulness to the Council seeking to establish that an alleged livery yard at the site
had resulted in a material change of use of the land existing more than five years. The basis of this application was to establish the lawfulness of this equestrian use to gain policy support for the unauthorised dwelling referred to above under Policy CTY 10 of PPS 21: Dwellings on a Farm.

The Council determined the application and certificated as lawful development a number of the buildings and sand school, the use of the land and building to keep horses for recreational equestrian use including livery use as an ancillary use, on 24 January 2018. That decision was then appealed and heard concurrently with the Enforcement Notice appeal on 15 August 2018.

The Commissioner found that the livery business had been established and had been in continuous operation for more than 5 years and at least 6 years, therefore meeting criterion (a) of Policy CTY 10 of PPS21: Dwellings on a Farm. In granting the Certificate of Lawfulness in this regard, the ground (a) ‘deemed application’ ground of appeal in relation to the Enforcement Appeal was then considered to comply with the relevant policies in PPS21 and thus the unauthorised dwelling was granted approval. As such the Enforcement Notice was quashed.

New Appeals

The following appeal was lodged on 5 March 2019.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appeal Reference</th>
<th>2018/A0232</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Application Reference</td>
<td>LA06/2017/0491/F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appeal by</td>
<td>Mr Eric McVea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject of Appeal</td>
<td>Refusal of retrospective agricultural shed for the purpose of indoor cattle wintering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Land approxiamtely 30m west of No.4 Ballyblack Road East, Newtownards</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Council refused the application on 7 November 2018 for a number of reasons including Policies CTY 8, 12 and 13 of PPS21: Sustainable Development in the Countryside.

Details of appeal decisions, new appeals and scheduled hearings could be viewed at www.pacni.gov.uk

RECOMMENDED that Members note the content of this report.

Councillor Walker referred to the appeal in the McCullough case, 19-21 Bridge Street, Bangor and queried the implications for future applications. The Head of Planning informed the Member that the Commissioner’s stance had been completely different from the previous approach of the Commission and there had been another error in the report and assumptions made which were beyond the control of the Council. It was the intention of the Council to raise that with the Commission directly.

AGREED TO RECOMMEND, on the proposal of Alderman Gibson, seconded by Alderman Graham, that the recommendation be adopted.
6. **PLANNING BUDGETARY CONTROL REPORT – FEBRUARY 2019**

PREVIOUSLY CIRCULATED:- Report dated 19 March 2019 from the Director of Regeneration, Development and Planning covering the 11-month period 1 April 2018 to 28 February 2019 and was set out. The net cost of the service was showing an under spend of £48,042 (5.0%).

**Explanation of Variance**

A Budgetary Control Report by Income and Expenditure for Planning was, also, shown which analysed the overall favourable variance (£48,042) by expenditure (£106,674 favourable) and income (£58,632 adverse).

**PLANNING**

**Expenditure - £106.7k (5.6%) better than budget to date.** The favourable variance was mainly made up of the following: -

a. Payroll £116.6k favourable due to vacancies. Full complement of the Administration team in place from 1 February 2019. One vacant HPTO post had recently been filled but another HPTO vacancy was still to be filled following an unsuccessful recruitment exercise. There had been a knock-on effect regarding staffing due to backfilling required for maternity cover, and resignations.

b. Legal costs were £49.6k over budget to date. That had been as result of ongoing complex enforcement cases which had required specialist legal advice, including counsel representation at appeal hearings and court.

c. There were underspends to date on other expenditure lines such as mileage (£11.5k), hired services (£7.4k) and consultancy (£11.1k).

**Income - £58.6k (6.3%) worse than budget to date.** The adverse variance was mainly made up of the following: -

d. Planning application income was £36.2k lower than budget for the year to date.

e. Planning property certificate income was £22.0k worse than budget to date. Planning property certificates had not been subject to VAT to date but the Council had recently been informed that this may change. The report assumed that would happen so the impact would be less income accruing to the Council, and so, gave rise to the adverse variance as this was unknown when the 2018/19 budget was set. If the VAT status did not change the Planning property certificate income would be in line with budget at the end of February.
RECOMMENDED that the Committee notes this report.

AGREED TO RECOMMEND, on the proposal of Alderman McDowell, seconded by Alderman Graham, that the recommendation be adopted.

CLOSING REMARKS

The Chairman closed by informing Members that it would be his last meeting as Chairman of the Planning Committee. He put on record his thanks to the Vice-Chairman, the Director and the excellent Planning Officers of the Council. He wished the next Chairman of the Planning Committee much success. He also thanked the Democratic Services team for taking minutes at the meeting and he was aware that it was not the easiest of meetings to attend.

Alderman Gibson offered his thanks to the Chairman and stated that there were times he felt like he was being difficult but Councillor Cathcart had offered him his full support and took a team approach to the Committee and acted in fairness at all times. He added that the Planning Officers had done a good job for the Borough.

Alderman Girvan thanked Councillor Cathcart for his patience and for chairing the Planning Committee which was not an easy role since that Committee was not one for the faint hearted.
Alderman Henry agreed with those comments and wished Councillor Cathcart well.

Alderman Fletcher added his praise to the Chairman for keeping the Committee strong as a team. He himself was not standing for election to the new Council but he urged Council to keep the core and existing team together as far as possible since they had learnt much and that knowledge should be built upon.

Councillor McIlveen congratulated the Chairman for his stewardship of the Committee and wished Alderman Fletcher well for the future. He thought that having Alderman Fletcher at meetings ensured that there had never been a dull moment and that he would be greatly missed at Council.

Alderman McDowell concluded the comments by congratulating the Chairman. As his Deputy he praised Councillor Cathcart’s attention to detail and had enjoyed working with him. He also added that Alderman Fletcher would be greatly missed and it had been very useful to have different points of view represented on the Committee. Alderman Fletcher’s agricultural experience had been invaluable.

**TERMINATION OF MEETING**

The meeting terminated at 9.29 pm.
The sale and supply of Alcoholic Drinks at ‘Special Events’ in Northern Ireland

Consultation Document
The sale and supply of Alcoholic Drinks at ‘Special Events’ in Northern Ireland
Why are we consulting?

The Department for Communities (the Department) is responsible for the policy and legislation relating to the sale and supply of alcoholic drinks in Northern Ireland.

The purpose of this consultation document is to take your views on some policy changes the Department wishes to make, which will benefit the hospitality and tourism sectors in Northern Ireland.

In doing so, the Department will balance the need for change with the need for appropriate controls.

What are we consulting on?

The focus of the consultation is a change in law which would provide the Department with a power to designate an event taking place in Northern Ireland as a “special event.” The Department, having designated an event as a “special event”, would then have the power to vary permitted hours for the sale of alcoholic drinks at the event. The Department would also have a power to permit the sale of alcoholic drinks for consumption off the premises at special events.

Consultation responses will be used as evidence in the decision making process for the way forward.

The Department is consulting at this time because The 148th Open Golf Championship takes place at Royal Portrush Golf Club in July.

A change in the law before this event takes place will contribute to the success of the event and improve the prospects of this event and others coming to Northern Ireland in the near future.
How to respond

This public consultation is open for the next six weeks until **Friday 3 May 2019**. Please respond using the question and answer template provided. Your response will be most useful if it is framed in direct response to the questions posed, although further comments and evidence are also welcome.

We encourage respondents to respond to this consultation online wherever possible as this is the Department’s preferred method of receiving responses. This can be done at www.communities-ni.gov.uk/consultations.

Responses submitted in writing or by email will also be accepted. Email responses to this consultation should be sent to social.policy@communities-ni.gov.uk. Alternatively you may post your response to the Department at:

**Special Events Consultation**  
**Department for Communities**  
**Social Policy Unit**  
**Level 8, Causeway Exchange**  
**1-7 Bedford Street**  
**Belfast**  
**BT2 7EG**

If you require an alternative format (Braille, audio, CD, etc.), please contact the Department on social.policy@communities-ni.gov.uk and appropriate arrangements will be made as soon as possible.

Following the end of the consultation, the Department may publish anonymised quotes from your consultation response but these will not identify you as an individual. Further detail on this, and how it relates to access to information legislation, can be found at Annex 1.
Impact Assessments

The impact of varying permitted hours and/or permitting off-sales in certain circumstances at special events, designated as such by the Department, was analysed for equality of opportunity, health impact, rural impact and human rights impact and the need for an Equality Impact Assessment (EQIA), Health Impact Assessment (HIA), Rural Needs Impact Assessment (RIA) and Human Rights Assessment (ECHR) were screened out. Copies of the screening forms can be viewed on the Department’s website.

The proposals do not impose any costs and provide no saving on business, charities, social economy enterprises or the voluntary sector, therefore the need for a Regulatory Impact Assessment was screened out. A copy of the screening form can be viewed on the Department’s website.

An Economic Impact Assessment (EIA) has been completed and is available on the Department’s website. The EIA will be revisited to ensure all relevant issues have been taken into account and finalised prior to the introduction of any new legislation.
The sale and supply of Alcoholic Drinks at ‘Special Events’ in Northern Ireland

Context

BACKGROUND
The permitted hours for the sale of alcoholic drinks in Northern Ireland is, subject to exemptions, 11.30am to 11pm Monday to Saturday and 12.30pm to 10pm on a Sunday. In certain circumstances these hours can be extended to 1am Monday to Saturday and 12midnight on a Sunday.

The Department is aware that the organisers of a number of prestigious events have found these hours restrictive, and reported that they have impacted negatively on the visitor experience.

The sale of alcoholic drinks for consumption at home (off-sales) is only permitted from pubs and off-licences. The Department has been advised that this has also impacted negatively on a number of events held in Northern Ireland in recent years where organisers wanted to sell commemorative bottles of alcoholic drinks for consumption off the premises.

The Department believes that it is important to recognise the significant contribution the hospitality industry makes to the local economy, and assist it where possible.

POLICY INTENT
The Department wishes to be given the power to vary the permitted hours at “special events” and to permit off-sales in certain circumstances.

This would mean that events which attract significant public interest, such as The BBC Good Food Show, The Irish Open Golf Tournament, The Open Golf Tournament and the MTV Music Awards may have the opportunity to extend their offering by serving alcoholic drinks outside the current permitted hours, or in certain circumstances to sell alcoholic drinks for consumption at home.

The Department has a responsibility to ensure that any increase in opportunity to purchase and consume alcoholic drinks is considered in the context of public safety and public health. It therefore has given consideration to what controls may be necessary.

The Department intends to limit the type of premises which may benefit from such a designation and to impose conditions where necessary. It is anticipated that the number of events designated as special events by the Department will be very small.
Consultation

This consultation wishes to test public opinion on the proposed change to the law regulating the sale and supply of alcoholic drinks in Northern Ireland.

We are seeking views on:

Q.1 Should the Department be given the power to designate an event as a “special event”?

................................................................................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................................................................................

Q.2 Should the Department be given the power to vary permitted hours at an event, having designated it as a special event?

................................................................................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................................................................................
Q.3 Should the Department be given the power to permit the sale of alcoholic drinks for consumption off the premises at a special event?

Q.4 Should the Department be given the power to impose conditions on an event designated as a special event?
Department of Health
An Roinn Sláinte
Männystrie O Poustie
www.health-ni.gov.uk

RESHAPING STROKE CARE
SAVING LIVES, REDUCING DISABILITY
Consultation Document
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GLOSSARY

**Acute stroke units** - These are dedicated hospital wards used for stroke patients and they require specially trained medical, nursing and therapeutic staff. They provide care and rehabilitation until a person is ready to go home. This is normally from the third day after stroke until discharge to the community.

**Early Supported Discharge (ESD)** - This is a service provided by Community Stroke Teams. It responds quickly after discharge to continue rehabilitation and support, for those who no longer require hospital services. It should provide therapy at the same intensity as it would have been provided in hospital.

**Hyperacute stroke units** - This is the phase of care, usually during the first three days, in which a patient is assessed and admitted. Hyperacute stroke units require highly skilled staff, with access to advanced imaging equipment 24 hours a day, seven days a week.

**Stroke** - A condition caused by impaired blood flow to the brain following a blood clot or a bleed in the brain. Impairments in movement, balance, speech, vision or thinking may result.

**Stroke Services National Audit Programme (SSNAP)** - SSNAP measures the quality and organisation of stroke care in the NHS and is the single source of stroke data in England, Wales, and Northern Ireland. SSNAP measures both the processes of care provided to stroke patients, and the structure of stroke services (organisational audit) against evidence based standards.

**Thrombolysis** - Also known as clot busting therapy, this is a medicine which is delivered by an intravenous drip to stroke patients within four and a half hours of the first symptoms of stroke.

**Thrombectomy or Clot Removal** - A procedure performed by skilled doctors to remove large clots from blood vessels in the brain, usually within six hours of the onset of stroke.

**Transient Ischaemic Attack (TIA)** - A diagnosis given to some patients where there are temporary symptoms similar to a stroke but that resolve within 24 hours.
FOREWORD
by the Permanent Secretary

Stroke is one of the most devastating health crises anyone can face. And the reality is that, today, the service we provide for those impacted by this is not as good as it could or should be. Put simply, our current model fails users of this service.

In determining how we improve this, we need to be clear that this issue is much more complex than the location of services - while travel time is clearly a consideration, a much more important one is the quality and expertise of the service patients travel to. Currently, stroke services are too thinly spread, and too many units are struggling to maintain sustainable quality care and staffing levels.

The evidence couldn’t be clearer – consolidating hospital services into hyperacute stroke units means better care and better outcomes for patients:

* Thrombectomy – the revolutionary stroke treatment involving mechanical retrieval of a clot from the brain – can be available round the clock seven days a week in Northern Ireland (NI) for the first time.

* Thrombolysis - the clot busting drug – can be administered to more patients more quickly by trained staff in dedicated centres of excellence.

* Patients suffering from TIAs - Transient Ischaemic Attack or mini strokes - can have access to TIA clinics 7 days a week, providing specialist assessment within 24 hours of symptoms. Better and more focused care will reduce their risk of full-blown strokes.

This consultation represents the start of a once-in-a-generation opportunity to make stroke care better. By better, I am not focussing on improved processes or access to care, but on patient outcomes - saving lives, significantly reducing long-term disability and taking major steps forward in stroke prevention.

These goals are all within our grasp. But to achieve them we must re-shape current provision to establish a number of Hyperacute Stroke Units. These Units will be suitably staffed, with expert teams on the spot 24 hours a day, seven days a week, ensuring stroke patients have ready access to the latest in diagnostic testing and treatment. These specialist centres will secure improved stroke outcomes, higher patient satisfaction levels and shorter hospital stays.
And, crucially, staff will have increased opportunities to maintain and build their expertise and experience. Only by having higher volumes of patients will that be possible.

Of course, I recognise that change is never easy, and there is a lot to think about – with six different options on the way forward. But it starts with the inescapable premise that change is needed.

We cannot ignore the evidence - consolidating care and expertise will save lives and reduce disability, and maintaining the status quo is simply not good enough.

We can and must do better.

**Richard Pengelly**
Permanent Secretary,
Department of Health
INTRODUCTION

What is a stroke?
A stroke occurs when blood supply to part of the brain is interrupted by either a blood clot or a bleed, and surrounding brain tissue is damaged or dies.

There are two main types of stroke:

- Ischaemic, caused by a clot blocking or narrowing an artery carrying blood to the brain. Ischaemic strokes are the most common; and

- Haemorrhagic strokes, caused when a blood vessel supplying the brain bursts.

What is the impact of stroke?
Stroke is the single largest cause of adult disability in the UK, the fourth largest cause of death, and two thirds of those who survive stroke have a life changing disability.

Stroke is a major health issue in NI with around 2,800 people being admitted to hospital each year and 36,000 stroke survivors living in our communities. It is important that every opportunity is taken to secure excellent care for people after a stroke and give them the best possible chance of a good recovery.

The number of people in NI experiencing stroke each year is likely to increase in future because of a growing older population, with three out of four people who experience stroke being over the age of 65.
RESHAPING STROKE SERVICES

In 2017, the Health and Social Care Board and the Public Health Agency carried out a pre-consultation seeking views on a range of proposals to reshape stroke services. Over 800 responses, together with a further 3,000 template responses were received.

Those responses indicated high levels of support for some of the proposals but also significant levels of concern about the impact that implementation of some of the changes may have. A number of the responses to the pre-consultation focused on the potential impact on travel times for patients, their carers, and their families, particularly for those living in more rural areas.

In response to those views, the University of Calgary and the University of Exeter were commissioned to undertake modelling to provide a robust evidence base on the impact of reshaping hospital-based stroke services, including on travel time and clinical outcomes. We explore this further later in the document.

We also outline other actions taken to date, including investment in Early Supported Discharge and plans to expand the availability of thrombectomy.

This document, which follows on from the pre-consultation, is the next stage in a long term process to improve stroke services in NI. Services across NI have been improving in recent years, but there is still significant variation across sites in terms of the time patients are seen and the treatment they access.
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Stroke is a major health issue in NI with around 2,800 people being admitted to a hospital each year and 36,000 stroke survivors living in our communities. It is important that every opportunity is taken to secure excellent care for people after a stroke and give them the best possible chance of a good recovery.

The impact of stroke can be devastating. While there are treatments which can help deliver significantly improved outcomes, stroke patients in NI do not always get access to the optimum treatment:

- TIA clinics are only available 5 days per week, yet we know that people should receive specialist assessment within 24 hours of symptoms occurring because of the risk of stroke;

- There are variations in the length of time taken to provide thrombolysis to stroke patients when we know that thrombolysis is more effective the earlier it is given;

- Thrombectomy is only available from Monday – Friday 08.30am – 5.30pm which means that not all those who could potentially benefit have access to the treatment;

- Research undertaken by the Stroke Association indicates that the needs of stroke survivors in the community, including emotional and cognitive needs and support for family carers, are not being met.

Services across NI have been improving in recent years, but there is still significant variation across sites in terms of the time patients are seen and the treatment they access. We know that there are steps we can take to strengthen these services and we outline a number of commitments about how we intend to do so.

But, if we are to fully deliver on the potential to improve stroke care, we need to look beyond individual services to consider how and where services are provided.

The single most important factor in delivering better outcomes for stroke patients is the quality of care provided in a stroke unit. Evidence ranging from RQIA reports to audits of performance carried out by the Royal College of Physicians (RCP) and London School of Economics demonstrate that services are falling short. For example, only 40% of stroke patients are admitted to a stroke ward within 4 hours.
Guidance from the RCP and the National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) recommend that services should be provided in a hyperacute setting in the first few days after a stroke. The services provided in a hyperacute stroke unit are only available to a minority of patients in NI and the treatment available varies significantly depending on location and time of admission. This document proposes that a network of Hyperacute Stroke Units (HASUs) and Acute Stroke Units (ASUs) should be established in NI. This would mean that some patients will go to their nearest Hyperacute Stroke Unit first to get rapid assessment and clot busting therapy, with transfer to the regional thrombectomy centre in Belfast where appropriate. Other patients would go directly to Belfast, bypassing their nearest hospitals.

In order to make this work, it is essential that each stroke service has the specialist staff and facilities to provide rapid brain imaging and treatment on a 24/7 basis so that there are no delays identifying and transferring those patients who require thrombectomy.

This document contains six options for reshaping the current configuration of stroke services and seven commitments for developing stroke care that will be necessary to underpin and support any new model. Each of the options involves consolidating services into a smaller number of centres where patients will be able to access Hyperacute Stroke Care 24 hours a day, 7 days a week.

As part of this work, we commissioned the University of Calgary and the University of Exeter to undertake modelling to provide a robust evidence base on the impact of reshaping hospital-based stroke services, including on travel time and clinical outcomes. It is worth highlighting that, according to this modelling, each of the options considered in this document would offer significantly improved outcomes for patients compared with the way services are currently provided in hospitals.

There are significant challenges within the stroke workforce. We know that there is a challenge in developing and maintaining skills with some hospitals seeing relatively small numbers of stroke admissions. The success of any new service model will be absolutely dependent on staff being employed and deployed in such a way that makes the best use of their skills and which allows them to continue to develop as professionals while providing the services that users and patients need. The patient experience, and their perception of the quality of care they receive, depends in a very significant way on having well-trained, experienced and motivated frontline staff.

The evidence is clear that we need to organise stroke services to give patients with acute stroke the best possible chance wherever they are in NI. It is unacceptable that the stroke treatment people
receive - including access to brain scans and the clot busting drug thrombolysis - should vary according to where they live.

The consultation will run from 26 March 2019 to 18 June 2019. A consultation questionnaire is available at www.health-ni.gov.uk/consultations/reshaping-stroke-care and the Department would encourage everyone to have their say on this important issue.
ABOUT THIS DOCUMENT

Part 1 of this document looks at the current stroke pathway from prevention through to hospital services and support in the community following stroke and considers how services can be further improved. We have made seven commitments to drive this improvement:

COMMITMENT 1: We will identify a regional model for TIA assessment by March 2020 and implement that model by 2022 to deliver a 7 day service of specialist assessment within 24 hours of symptoms.

COMMITMENT 2: By 2022 we will remove the variance in delivering thrombolysis to ensure that patients across NI have timely access to the treatment.

COMMITMENT 3: We will continue to invest in the growth of thrombectomy, increasing hours of operation to Monday – Friday 8am-8pm service by December 2019, and moving to 24/7 service by 2022.

COMMITMENT 4: We will reshape stroke services by 2022 to establish dedicated hyperacute and acute stroke units underpinned by regional service standards to deliver improved outcomes for stroke patients.

COMMITMENT 5: The recently published Stroke Association document ‘Struggling to recover’ makes six recommendations to improve services. Alongside the reshaping of hospital services, we are committed to driving improvement in rehabilitation and long-term support and will use the Stroke Association’s analysis and recommendations as a blueprint to drive that improvement.

COMMITMENT 6: The HSC will undertake a workforce review to identify the staffing and skill mix required to deliver effective stroke services.

COMMITMENT 7: We will extend the partnership with the charity AANI to enable the Helicopter Emergency Medical Service (HEMS) to provide a secondary response to incidents including strokes by 2022 to improve access to services, particularly from rural areas.

Part 2 of the document focuses on reshaping hospital-based stroke services and outlines how we have used available evidence to develop six options of how hospital-based stroke services can be reshaped. We are particularly keen to hear your views on these options.
PART 1: THE CURRENT STROKE PATHWAY

PREVENTION

HOSPITAL-BASED CARE

REHABILITATION
PREVENTION

It is known that many strokes can be prevented. People at a higher risk of stroke include those with high blood pressure, irregular heartbeat, heart disease and diabetes. Addressing lifestyle factors plays a key role in preventing strokes. This includes smoking cessation, healthy eating, maintaining a healthy body weight, reducing high blood pressure and taking regular exercise. Knowing the signs and symptoms of a stroke and taking appropriate action are important in reducing the devastating effects of stroke. Prevention may also include the treatment of people with atrial fibrillation with medicine to thin the blood, and prevent clots forming that may cause a stroke.

FAST campaign
Knowing the signs and symptoms of a stroke and taking appropriate action are important in reducing the devastating effects of stroke. The F.A.S.T public information campaign has been successful in making people aware of the signs of a stroke and the action to take. F.A.S.T stands for:

- **Face** – the face may have dropped on one side, the person may not be able to smile, or their mouth or eye may have dropped.
- **Arms** – the person with suspected stroke may not be able to lift both arms and keep them there because of weakness or numbness in one arm.
- **Speech** – their speech may be slurred or garbled, or the person may not be able to talk at all despite appearing to be awake.
- **Time** – it’s time to dial 999 immediately if you see any of these signs or symptoms.

Transient Ischaemic Attack (TIA)
A TIA or “mini stroke” is caused by a temporary disruption in the blood supply to part of the brain. This results in a lack of oxygen to the brain and can cause sudden symptoms similar to a stroke. However, a TIA doesn’t last as long. Symptoms usually only last for a few minutes or hours and fully disappear within 24 hours.
TIA ASSESSMENT

WHAT?

TIA patients should be treated as a medical emergency because these individuals are at a much higher risk of experiencing a stroke in the following days and weeks.

If treated quickly, the risk of a stroke occurring can be greatly reduced. Guidelines recommend that TIA patients, who are at high risk of a stroke, should be assessed by specialists within 24 hours of their first symptoms.

WHERE?

12 locations - Antrim, Causeway, Craigavon, Daisy Hill, Altnagelvin, South West Acute, Omagh, Royal Victoria, Mater, Ulster, Lagan Valley and Downe hospitals.

LEVELS OF PERFORMANCE

- TIA assessment clinics only receive referrals 5 days a week.
- It is estimated that up to 29% of high risk patients are not being assessed within 24 hours.
- Not all patients are being assessed within 24 hours – likely that these delays result in avoidable strokes.
- Currently more than 800 hospital admissions with TIAs each year – some of these could be avoided if seven day TIA clinics were available.

COMMITMENT TO IMPROVEMENT

COMMITMENT 1: We will identify a regional model for TIA assessment by March 2020 and implement that model by 2022 to deliver a 7 day service of specialist assessment within 24 hours of symptoms.
HOSPITAL-BASED CARE

The current hospital pathway
If an ambulance crew suspects that someone may have suffered a stroke they will bring a patient to one of eight locations to be assessed for a blood thinning treatment called thrombolysis. Thrombolysis isn’t suitable for all patients, for example those on blood thinning medicine. The treatment is appropriate for approximately 1 in 5 patients.

Patients who have a particular large clot may be suitable for an intervention to remove a clot called thrombectomy.

Thrombectomy is a procedure which involves the insertion of a specially-designed clot removal device through a catheter into the blocked artery to remove the clot. This can be provided to some patients not suitable for thrombolysis and also to some patients after having received thrombolysis.

Approximately 1 in 10 stroke patients would benefit from thrombectomy. For every 100 people receiving the procedure, 20 will subsequently be able to lead an independent life, and 38 people will be less disabled after a stroke. This is approximately double what we would expect with normal treatment. However, thrombectomy is not currently available outside of 8.30am – 5.30pm Monday to Friday. Thrombectomy can provide benefits when carried out up to 24 hours after stroke onset, although once a patient has been identified as suitable for the treatment, they should receive it as soon as possible.

All stroke patients regardless of what treatment they receive should be directly admitted to a particular type of stroke ward called a hyperacute stroke unit. In this unit they are monitored very closely, receive all the necessary investigation, tests and assessments and will receive dedicated care from a multidisciplinary team of specialists. This is one of the most important elements of stroke care that greatly enhances the chances of a person making a good recovery.

Under our current system, only 4 in 10 patients are admitted to a stroke ward in the first 4 hours.

Following treatment in a hospital, patients can be discharged to their own home with a package of rehabilitation and support or to a non-acute hospital to allow further time for recovery. A small number of patients are also admitted to the Regional Acquired Brain Injury Unit.

Not everyone who is brought to hospital with symptoms similar to a stroke have experienced a stroke. This is because, in some cases,
the symptoms of conditions such as migraine can mimic those of a stroke. Within a reshaped model of care, it will be important to identify stroke mimics and ensure that those individuals who do not require hyperacute stroke care are directed onto the right pathway at the earliest opportunity to ensure they receive care in the right environment.

The stroke pathway is outlined in the diagram below.

The stroke pathway is outlined in the diagram below.

We look at each of these services in the following pages.
THROMBOLYSIS

WHAT?
Ischaemic strokes can often be treated using injections of a medication called alteplase which dissolves blood clots and restores blood flow to the brain. This is known as thrombolysis; it can be provided up to 4 and 1/2 hours after a stroke occurs, but is most effective if started as soon as possible after the stroke occurs.

WHERE?
8 locations at hospitals across NI - Antrim, Causeway, Craigavon, Daisy Hill, Altnagelvin, South West Acute, Royal Victoria, and Ulster hospitals

LEVELS OF PERFORMANCE
Within the current eight locations, we know that there is a wide variation in the number of people who receive thrombolysis. This ranges from just over 10% to just over 20% of stroke patients.

There is also significant variation in the time it takes to provide thrombolysis (door to needle time). From October to December 2018, the percentage of stroke patients who received thrombolysis within 1 hour ranged from just under 40% to 100%.

In the period April 2017 - March 2018, only the South West Acute Hospital met the SSNAP target of providing thrombolysis to a minimum of 15% of stroke patients.

Evidence from other parts of the UK suggests redirecting patients to larger stroke centres improves the rates of access to thrombolysis.

COMMITMENT TO IMPROVEMENT

COMMITMENT 2: By 2022 we will remove the variance in delivering thrombolysis to ensure that patients across NI have timely access to the treatment.
THROMBECTOMY

WHAT? A new, highly complex procedure which can remove a large clot from the brain following the most severe form of stroke.

Thrombectomy is more effective the earlier it is provided but may be effective in some cases up to 24 hours after the first stroke symptoms. In some cases it can be delivered after this point.

WHERE? The procedure is only provided at the Royal Victoria Hospital. Due to the specialist expertise required to deliver this service, and the necessary availability of complex support services on the site, it is likely that this could only ever be provided at a single regional centre.

LEVELS OF PERFORMANCE We are continuing to increase the number of people receiving thrombectomy. In 2018, 122 people underwent the procedure.

However, thrombectomy is currently only available from Monday – Friday 08.30am – 5.30pm. These restricted hours mean that the full potential of thrombectomy to further reduce disability is limited in NI.

COMMITMENT TO IMPROVEMENT

COMMITMENT 3: We will continue to invest in the growth of thrombectomy, increasing hours of operation to Monday – Friday 8am-8pm service by December 2019, and moving to 24/7 service by 2022.
STROKE WARDS

WHAT? Stroke wards provide levels of specialist care including access to specialist nurses, physicians and allied health professionals.

WHERE? 11 locations - Antrim, Causeway, Craigavon, Daisy Hill, Altnagelvin, South West Acute, Royal Victoria, Mater, Ulster, Lagan Valley and Downe hospitals.

The number of people admitted varies widely as shown below:

Emergency Admissions Stroke 2017/18

Source: Hospital Information System (HSC Data Warehouse) ICD 10 codes 161-164

LEVELS OF PERFORMANCE Only around half of people with strokes are admitted to stroke units - despite admission to a specialist unit being the single most important treatment for stroke patients.

In the period April 2017 – March 2018, only the Royal Victoria and South West Acute hospitals met the SSNAP target of ensuring that 90% of patients were admitted to a stroke unit.

Not all units meet the required standard.

Because the number of stroke patients attending each hospital is often small, patients are often admitted to care of general medical or elderly medicine consultants.

COMMITMENT TO IMPROVEMENT

COMMITMENT 4: We will reshape stroke services by 2022 to establish dedicated hyperacute and acute stroke units underpinned by regional service standards to deliver improved outcomes for stroke patients.
NON ACUTE HOSPITAL CARE

WHAT?
Provide ongoing rehabilitation, care and support with adapting to life after stroke. This applies to approximately 13% of stroke patients.

WHERE?
5 locations – Lurgan, Tyrone County, Whiteabbey, Mid Ulster and South Tyrone hospitals

LEVELS OF PERFORMANCE
The practice of providing general rehabilitation outside specialist stroke units is not supported by research or stroke clinical guidelines.

COMMITMENT TO IMPROVEMENT

COMMITMENT 4: We will reshape stroke services by 2022 to establish dedicated hyperacute and acute stroke units underpinned by regional service standards to deliver improved outcomes for stroke patients.
COMMUNITY REHABILITATION AND SUPPORT

Around two thirds of stroke survivors will require some continued support or rehabilitation in the community after discharge from hospital. Up to 40% of stroke survivors may be suitable for ‘Early Supported Discharge’ which replicates the specialist stroke therapy normally provided in hospital within the home environment. This should be available seven days a week. Only the Belfast and South Eastern Trusts provide access to these services at the weekend. In recognition of this, the HSC is investing an additional £1.3m in the roll out of Early Supported Discharge.

Continued support for life after stroke
Stroke rehabilitation usually begins in hospital in a stroke unit and continues after hospital discharge by either a community stroke team or an early supported discharge team.

The aim of stroke rehabilitation is to relearn skills lost after a stroke and improve the quality of life for the stroke survivor. The severity of stroke complications and each person’s ability to recover vary widely. This service should be delivered by a core multidisciplinary team consisting of a doctor, nurse, physiotherapist, occupational therapist, psychologist, social worker, speech and language therapists, and other specialists/services as required eg orthoptists, orthotists, continence advice. Members of the core multidisciplinary stroke team should screen the person with stroke for a range of impairments and disabilities in order to inform and direct further assessment and treatment.

The duration of stroke rehabilitation depends on stroke severity and related complications. Some stroke survivors recover quickly but many need some form of long-term stroke rehabilitation, lasting possibly months after their stroke. Rehabilitation needs can change during recovery.

Local health and social care providers should have robust systems and processes to ensure the safe transfer and long-term care of people after stroke, including those in care homes. This should include timely exchange of information between different providers using locally agreed protocols. Patients should receive information about services provided by voluntary agencies in their localities and carers should be offered a carers assessment.

Responses to the pre-consultation were strongly in favour of the provision of support from the HSC and voluntary sector to stroke
survivors and their carers. Charities such as the Stroke Association and NI Chest Heart and Stroke provide a range of support services designed to improve the health, wellbeing and quality of life for stroke survivors. This includes My Stroke Guide, an online community providing digital support during recovery from stroke, family support services, self management programmes and carers groups.

We know, however, from research undertaken by the Stroke Association in conjunction with the Ulster University that stroke survivors feel that more rehabilitation, psychological and emotional support is required, and that the experience of moving from hospital into the community remains too often a poor one. The Stroke Association’s report, ‘Struggling to recover’ identified some challenging findings including:

- 45% of all stroke survivors felt abandoned when they left hospital;
- 90% of stroke survivors felt that their emotional and cognitive needs were not met once they left hospital; and
- 85% of carers do not feel prepared for their loved one to come home from hospital following a stroke.

Work is already underway to improve support services. For example, the Health and Social Care Stroke Network has agreed a project focusing specifically on long term care. This will see the development of a single regional stroke support pathway for the provision of a range of support services, the identification of gaps in current service provision and the development of a single regional contract specification to reduce duplication and improve equity of access. It is intended that this work will conclude in Summer 2019. In addition, pilots are planned to deliver emotional support through a partnership between the HSC and the voluntary sector. These will be evaluated to determine their impact. But much more can be done.

**COMMITMENT 5:** ‘Struggling to recover’ makes six recommendations to improve services. Alongside the reshaping of hospital services, we are committed to driving improvement in rehabilitation and long-term support and will use the Stroke Association’s analysis and recommendations as a blueprint to drive that improvement.
THE STROKE WORKFORCE

Around 350 staff are directly employed within hospital stroke services across NI. The largest groups are nursing staff, Allied Health Professionals (AHPs) and medical staff.

Hospital stroke services also link closely with many staff in other services such as: Radiology, Interventional Neuroradiology, Northern Ireland Ambulance Service, Emergency Departments and regional Neurosciences.

Consultant physicians working in stroke services in NI also provide care across general medicine and acute care of the elderly. The exception is the Royal Victoria Hospital which has dedicated stroke consultants.

There are significant challenges within the stroke workforce. Currently four hospitals have vacant consultant posts and the HSC is also experiencing a shortage of nursing and AHP staff across all services. This means that the stroke workforce is currently too thinly deployed across too many sites. In practice this leads to three key issues:

- It leaves services reliant on temporary locum or agency cover, which comes at a high cost and which would be better invested in services that are sustainable in the long term.

- Staff working on smaller sites face challenges in developing and maintaining skills with some hospitals seeing relatively small numbers of stroke admissions.

- It is proving difficult to recruit and retain junior medical staff to deliver services where they would be unlikely to get the experience they need in terms of volumes and case mix in order to maintain their skills and develop new skills.

We also know that there is a challenge in developing and maintaining skills with some hospitals seeing relatively small numbers of stroke admissions.

Furthermore, it is proving difficult to recruit and retain junior medical staff to deliver services where they would be unlikely to get the experience they need in terms of volumes and case mix in order to maintain their skills and develop new skills. The success of any new service model will be absolutely dependent on staff being employed and deployed in such a way that makes the best use of their skills and which allows them to continue to develop as professionals.
while providing the services that users and patients need. The patient experience, and their perception of the quality of care they receive, depends in a very significant way on having well-trained, experienced and motivated frontline staff.

**COMMITMENT 6:** The HSC will undertake a workforce review to identify the staffing and skill mix required to deliver effective stroke services.
PART 2: RESHAPING HOSPITAL-BASED CARE

In 2012, the Regulation and Quality Improvement Authority (RQIA) carried out a review of stroke services. Overall the key findings were that stroke services in NI were too fragmented between hospital sites, many patients were not being cared for in optimal environments, and new time-critical interventions, such as thrombectomy, were not always available on a 24/7 basis. The review also highlighted the need for progression of clinical competencies and training relating to stroke and the establishment of clearly defined stroke units and dedicated stroke wards. This proved difficult to achieve and sustain in smaller hospitals where recruitment and retention of specialist staff is a recognised problem.

The Bengoa Report (‘Systems not Structures: Changing Health and Social Care’), published in 2016, highlighted the Department of Health’s (England) National Stroke Strategy which identified that care in a stroke unit was the single most important factor in improving patients’ outcomes after stroke. Based on these findings, in 2010 acute stroke services were centralised across London. Prior to this, acute stroke services were provided in 30 hospitals. After reconfiguration, specialist care was provided in eight designated hyper acute stroke units 24/7. Evidence suggests that, following the reforms, there was a significant reduction in mortality at 3, 30 and 90 days after admission to a HASU, leading to 96 extra lives being saved per year. There was also a reduction in the length of time stroke patients spent in hospital compared to before reorganisation.

The experience in London demonstrated that, if you have a stroke, you are likely to make a better recovery and have a reduced chance of mortality if you are treated in a fully equipped specialist unit filled with experienced staff. This is more likely in a hyperacute stroke unit, even if you may have to travel further than your local hospital to get there.

Bengoa also highlighted clinical evidence which shows that patients are 25% more likely to survive or recover from stroke if treated in a specialised centre. Other benefits include:

- Improved levels of stroke care in line with National Audit (SSNAP) recommendations – appropriate staffing levels to allow early assessment, observation and early rehabilitation input.
- The highest quality medical care in hospital (more concentrated levels of specialist medical, nursing and AHP care).
Patients being admitted to a specialist stroke unit as a ward of first admission. Latest medical evidence demonstrates that where patients are treated in specialist stroke units they achieve best outcomes.

Better rehabilitation outcomes - a specialised service which will bring community and hospital based staff together as an integrated team providing care to stroke patients. This will provide more focused care and continuity of service provision throughout the patient’s pathway.

Reduced length of stay in hospital - more focused community based rehabilitation to allow stroke patients to be discharged from hospital earlier and recover at home.

Stroke unit care can reduce death and disability but not everyone who would benefit from this care is currently receiving it. In NI, patients are not routinely admitted to this type of unit. Usually only those who receive thrombolysis or are clinically unstable on arrival, receive close monitoring in the hours after stroke. This is currently only 12.5% of strokes across NI. We also know that, despite the best efforts of staff working in a challenging environment, the performance of stroke services falls below the level we would like to provide and which patients have a right to expect.

We want to reshape and improve hospital-based stroke services, focusing on improved outcomes by delivering the best possible treatment at the earliest opportunity.

Building on best practice guidelines and standards, we believe that the best way to improve outcomes for the majority of people who have strokes is through the establishment of Hyperacute Stroke Units (HASUs) and Acute Stroke Units (ASUs). This model is outlined below:

**HYPERACUTE Stroke Unit**
- 1st 72 hours
- Access to specialist imaging equipment 24 hours a day, 7 days a week
- High levels of specialist medical and nursing staff

**ACUTE Stroke Unit**
- 60-70% of patients need some further hospital care
- For every 100 treated in ASU rather than a general ward, 5 more will survive at 12 months and 13 more will be independent at discharge
Hyperacute Stroke Units (HASUs)
The Royal College of Physicians and the NICE Stroke Guidelines recommend that every stroke patient should be closely monitored for the first few days in a hyperacute stroke unit. The absence of a hyperacute stroke model in NI means that access to this level of treatment varies significantly depending on geographical location and time of day. In NI, less than 40% of people who have strokes have access to this level of care.

A hyperacute stroke unit requires more intensive nursing, AHP and medical care than in an acute stroke unit. Under the proposals in this document the following infrastructure will be the minimum required at any future location throughout NI to deliver hyperacute stroke unit care:

- Consultant-led Emergency Departments operational 24 hours a day, seven days a week.
- Deliver all the investigations that a patient requires 24 hours a day, seven days a week.
- Highly skilled stroke multi-disciplinary team including clinical nurse consultants, advanced nurse practitioners, AHPs, specialist nurses, and senior nurse decision makers 24 hours a day.
- Potential to deliver a stroke consultant assessment 24 hours a day, seven days a week with a minimum of a six consultants rota.
- Deliver rapid emergency stroke protocols in the Emergency Department with direct admission to a hyperacute stroke unit or rapid transfer to the Royal Victoria Hospital for further assessment for Thrombectomy when required.

Following hyperacute care, around 40% of patients should be discharged home to community stroke services. The remaining 60% of patients would continue to receive care in an ASU. In Manchester, the reconfiguration of stroke services led to a significant reduction in length of hospital stay by 2 days.

Acute Stroke Units (ASUs)
An acute stroke unit is where hospital care and rehabilitation is provided by a specialist team until a person is ready to be discharged home. This usually commences around the third day. Rehabilitation services are currently delivered in subacute hospitals such as Lurgan, Whiteabbey, and Tyrone County hospitals. However, the proposals in this document envisage that in future all stroke specific rehabilitation would be delivered within specialist acute stroke units.
Although not an acute stroke unit, it is planned that the Regional Acquired Brain Injury Unit at Musgrave Park Hospital will continue in future to have a very important role in delivering specialist rehabilitation to the small group of complex stroke patients whose needs are best met within that environment.

We know from the evidence elsewhere that this approach works. Approximately 100 lives a year have been saved since changes to the way stroke services are organised in London were introduced. Manchester has implemented similar changes with positive results, particularly in reducing the number of days patients need to stay in hospital recovering from a stroke.


Workforce Development
In delivering a new model of stroke care, it will of course be absolutely critical to ensure that the workforce is in place to deliver it. The Bengoa Review revealed that the demands facing the current service model, for most specialties, covering community, primary and secondary care services, are putting severe pressures on the workforce. This includes stroke services. This is not fair to the people who use our services, nor is it fair to the HSC staff who deliver them. Resolving this is not about money, it is about creating an environment in which staff are enabled and empowered to do the jobs they have been trained to do in a way that meets patients’ needs. As the evidence above demonstrates, the current stroke model has the patients in the wrong place and at the wrong time; this brings organisational de-motivation as staff feel unable to provide the highest quality of care to those they serve.

The Department therefore recognises that delivering the proposed new model will require significant change for a workforce which is already overstretched and under pressure. If the proposals in this document are approved, following consultation, a detailed workforce implementation plan will be produced to align the deployment of the current available stroke workforce with the new model and to better target investment in workforce to optimise the full potential of the proposed new model, subject to available resources.
VISION & DEVELOPING OPTIONS

VISION

The Department’s vision is that by reshaping stroke services, Health and Social Care in NI, will:

- By 2022, establish a regionally integrated network of Hyperacute Stroke Units, Acute Stroke Units and Community Rehabilitation Services; and

- By 2024, 95% of people with a stroke will be treated in a HASU.

DEVELOPING OPTIONS

The University of Exeter was commissioned to provide independent support and assurance for the identification of options for providing hyperacute stroke unit care.

This work utilised five years of data relating to stroke services in NI from hospital admissions and ambulance calls. A computer programme was developed which calculated the re-distribution of patients, the number of disability free outcomes, likely sustainability and population travel times.

All of the options considered in this document offer significantly improved outcomes compared with the way services are currently provided in hospitals.

Taking into account best practice and guidance, the analysis for each option considers the sustainability of the service and the impact on travel times.

Sustainability

Guidance from the Royal College of Physicians recommends that HASU’s should ideally admit more than 600 stroke admissions per year.¹ This number is suggested as the minimum size to attract a large cohort of specialist staff and sustain specialist rotas 24 hours a day, seven days a week. The only unit in NI currently admitting more than 600 stroke patients is the Royal Victoria hospital in Belfast. Under the options below, many of the units would still have admissions lower than 600, although this should also be considered in the context of an ageing population and an expected increase in the number of people experiencing strokes over time.

Guidance also recommends that once admissions exceed 1500 this presents an operational challenge and should be carefully managed.

Evidence also suggests that redirecting patients to larger stroke centres improves thrombolysis rates. High-volume centres have been associated with better adherence to guidelines and this has been associated with both improved stroke outcome and higher patient satisfaction.\(^2\)

**Travel time**

Reconfiguration of stroke services in London suggested targets for travel times of between 30 minutes and 60 minutes for the journey time from home to hyperacute stroke unit for treatment with thrombolysis. However, for a more dispersed urban/rural population such as NI, it is expected that travel times may be longer in some areas. The modelling therefore considered travel further than 60 minutes by road ambulance transport to a HASU.

The reshaping options in this document will mean longer travel time for some people compared with the current model of services. However, evidence from reconfiguration elsewhere demonstrates that patients who are treated in a HASU have better outcomes because they get a faster diagnosis and specialist treatment even if the journey to hospital is longer. It is also true that time spent travelling to hospital accounts for only a small proportion of the time between onset of stroke symptoms and hospital treatment. Stroke patients often take several hours to alert emergency services of their symptoms and often delays are experienced after arrival at hospital. These reforms would mean that patients are taken faster to the services they need in order to make the best possible recovery.

Nevertheless, we recognise that increased travel times are a source of anxiety and are considering a range of options to minimise travel time within the new model of care. This includes the potential expansion of the Helicopter Emergency Medical Service (HEMS) and the development of a new Clinical Response Model for the NI Ambulance Service. We consider these below.
The Northern Ireland Ambulance service plays a central role in ensuring that those with the most serious, life-threatening conditions get the most timely and appropriate response. As well as planned investment in the ambulance fleet and frontline staff, the Northern Ireland Ambulance Service has recently consulted on a new Clinical Response Model, similar to those introduced in recent years elsewhere in the UK. The new model is designed to provide a more clinically appropriate ambulance response than the current approach by better targeting the right resources (clinical skills and vehicle type) to the right patients.

The adoption of this new model is expected to realise a range of benefits for patients including:

- Reducing the proportion of patients receiving the highest level of response from circa 30% to a more appropriate 7%. This will allow resources to be focussed on improving the response to those patients identified as genuinely having an immediately life threatening condition;
- Identifying Category 1 patients earlier than is currently the case and allocating a resource more quickly than at present;

MEASURES TO ADDRESS TRAVEL TIME
A Helicopter Emergency Medical Service (HEMS) facilitates emergency medical assistance where immediate and rapid transportation is essential by carrying medical personnel and/or medical supplies and/or ill or injured persons and other persons directly involved.

An air ambulance is where the aircraft is an extension of the Ambulance Service’s land vehicles for the transfer of people from/to hospital.

The charity partnership to provide the HEMS service was introduced in NI in 2017. The service is currently targeted at what is known as ‘primary response’ incidents where medical personnel is transported direct to the scene of an incident and rapid transport is provided to transfer an unstable casualty to the nearest appropriate hospital.

The Department proposes to expand the partnership with the charity Air Ambulance NI (AANI) to enable the HEMS to provide a ‘secondary response’ to incidents where the aircraft would be dispatched to a designated site to meet a road ambulance coming either from an incident or from a hospital in order to provide rapid onward transport of the patient by helicopter to a hospital. Providing a service to both primary and secondary response incidents was strongly supported by respondees to a public consultation on the establishment of the HEMS with 96% in favour of this approach.
RESHAPING STROKE CARE

- Improving efficiency by reducing the deployment of multiple resources to incidents where the patient’s condition does not warrant that level of response;

- More effective targeting of the right resource, first time to meet the patient’s needs.

The new model should lead to improvements in the time patients with conditions such as Stroke and Heart Attack reach definitive care in specialist units. For example, for a patient with a suspected stroke the aim of the response will be to deliver them directly to a specifically identified centre of care i.e. a hospital with hyperacute stroke services, in as short a time as possible, thereby increasing the chances of receiving treatment aimed at reversing the effects of a stroke and increasing the likelihood of a better recovery.

In England, during the trials on a similar model, it was found that stroke patients were arriving in specialist centres sooner than under previous arrangements despite the initial ambulance response taking longer to arrive.

We also recognise that increasing travel time has an impact on the family, friends and carers of people who had a stroke. However, we believe that the benefits of reducing deaths and long-term disability caused by strokes outweighs the short-term impact for people visiting stroke patients in hospitals.

COMMITMENT 7: We will extend the partnership with the charity AANI to enable the Helicopter Emergency Medical Service (HEMS) to provide a secondary response to incidents including strokes by 2022 to improve access to services, particularly from rural areas.
THE OPTIONS

We have identified six options to reshape hospital-based care based on the establishment of Hyperacute Stroke Units (HASUs) and Acute Stroke Units (ASUs). These are summarised in the table below before being considered in more detail.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Configuration</th>
<th>HASU sites</th>
<th>ASU sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>5 HASUs</td>
<td>Royal Victoria, Craigavon, Altnagelvin, Antrim, South West</td>
<td>Royal Victoria, Craigavon, Altnagelvin, Antrim, South West</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>4 HASUs</td>
<td>Royal Victoria, Craigavon, Altnagelvin, Antrim.</td>
<td>Royal Victoria, Craigavon, Altnagelvin, Antrim (Possible 5th ASU at Ulster)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>4 HASUs</td>
<td>Royal Victoria, Craigavon, Altnagelvin, South West</td>
<td>Royal Victoria, Craigavon, Altnagelvin, South West (Possible 5th ASU at Ulster)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Phased approach</td>
<td>Stage 1: 4 HASUs</td>
<td>Royal Victoria, Craigavon, Altnagelvin, Antrim (Possible 5th ASU at Ulster)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Royal Victoria, Craigavon, Altnagelvin, South West</td>
<td>Royal Victoria, Craigavon, Altnagelvin, Antrim (Possible 5th ASU at Ulster)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Phased approach</td>
<td>Stage 1: 4 HASUs</td>
<td>Royal Victoria, Craigavon, Altnagelvin, South West (Possible 5th ASU at Ulster)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Royal Victoria, Craigavon, Altnagelvin, South West</td>
<td>Royal Victoria, Craigavon, Altnagelvin, Antrim (Possible 5th ASU at Ulster)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>3 HASUs</td>
<td>Royal Victoria, Craigavon, Altnagelvin</td>
<td>Royal Victoria, Craigavon, Altnagelvin, Antrim (Possible 5th ASU at Ulster)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**CURRENT SERVICE**

**BASELINE:** Thrombolysis-providing units at Royal Victoria, Ulster, Daisy Hill, Antrim, Altnagelvin, Causeway, Craigavon and South West hospitals

**Sustainability**
As outlined previously in this document, current services are not sustainable, with seven out of eight hospital sites having estimated annual admissions below the recommended levels. This may mean that staff at those hospitals do not have the opportunity needed to build and maintain relevant skills, and that consequently people attending those hospitals are not receiving the best possible treatment.

Having this many sites also means that the deployment of the current workforce is very stretched. For example, there is a shortage of consultants at more than half of the current sites.

**Estimated Annual Admissions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hospital</th>
<th>Estimated Admissions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Royal Victoria</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ulster</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craigavon</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antrim</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Causeway</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altnagelvin</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daisy Hill</td>
<td>900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South West</td>
<td>700</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Below Recommended Levels**
- **Recommended Levels**
- **Annual Admissions**
Travel time

With eight sites, travel time falls within 60 minutes. However, travel time alone is not sufficient to deliver better outcomes. It is more important that patients are taken as quickly as possible to the place where they will receive the best care. All of the reconfiguration options discussed in this document offer significantly improved outcomes over this current configuration despite longer travel times.
Sustainability
As outlined in the diagram below, four of the five HASU sites within this configuration have admission levels which fall below the recommended minimum level. This poses a potential risk to the sustainability of improved outcomes with staff potentially unable to get the experience they need to develop and maintain their specialist skills.

We recognise that the South West Acute Hospital (SWAH) performs well against standards and has a relatively small number of annual admissions. The performance of other hospitals with smaller levels of admissions would suggest that the SWAH’s performance is not one which can be easily replicated elsewhere. In looking at how services are provide in the future, we need to look at the sustainability not just of individual sites, but of our network of services as a whole.

Estimated Annual Admissions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>South West</th>
<th>Altnagelvin</th>
<th>Antrim</th>
<th>Craigavon</th>
<th>Royal Victoria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Estimated</td>
<td>1300</td>
<td>1400</td>
<td>1500</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>1700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HASU Admissions</td>
<td>Below Recommended Levels</td>
<td>Recommended Levels</td>
<td>HASU Admissions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OPTION A:** Hyperacute stroke units at Altnagelvin, Antrim, Craigavon, Royal Victoria and South West Acute hospitals. Acute stroke units co-located.
Travel time

This option performs well on travel times, with 99% of the population having a travel time to one of the HASU sites of 60 minutes or less and a maximum travel time of 66 minutes.
**OPTION B:** Hyperacute stroke units at Altnagelvin, Royal Victoria, Craigavon and Antrim hospitals. Acute stroke units to be co-located, with consideration of a fifth ASU at the Ulster hospital.

**Sustainability**
As outlined in the diagram below, both Antrim and Altnagelvin hospitals would have admission levels falling below the recommended level. This could mean that staff at these hospitals do not get the experience they need to build and maintain their expertise. This, in turn, may have a negative impact on patient outcomes with patients not receiving the right treatment in as timely a fashion as a hospital with higher levels of admission and therefore experience.

**Estimated Annual Admissions**

- **Below Recommended Levels**
- **Recommended Levels**
- **HASU Admissions**
Travel time

Under this option, 94% of the population are within a 60 minute travel time to one of the HASU sites. A relatively small proportion of the population would, however, see travel times in excess of 60 minutes, with a maximum travel time of 106 minutes.

In this context, the availability of an air ambulance for stroke patients is an important consideration in considering the potential to address excess travel time for those affected.
Sustainability
As outlined below, none of the HASU sites have admission levels within the recommended levels. A HASU at the Royal Victoria would see admissions of 1,613, above the recommended maximum of 1,500. It is likely that additional measures would be needed to ensure that sufficient capacity and staffing was in place to ensure a resilient service to meet this demand.

HASUs at Craigavon, Altnagelvin and South West Acute hospitals would have admissions which fall below the recommended level. This may mean that staff in those hospitals do not have the opportunity needed to build and maintain their specialist expertise which, in turn, may have a negative impact on patient outcomes with patients not receiving the right treatment in as timely a fashion as a hospital with higher levels of admission.

However, we recognise that the South West Acute Hospital (SWAH) performs well against standards and has a relatively small number of annual admissions. The performance of other hospitals with smaller

Estimated Annual Admissions

- **Option C**: Hyperacute stroke units at Royal Victoria, Altnagelvin, Craigavon and South West hospitals. Acute stroke units (ASUs) co-located with consideration of a fifth ASU at the Ulster hospital.
levels of admissions would suggest that the SWAH’s performance is not necessarily one which can be easily sustained or replicated elsewhere. In looking at how services are provided in the future, we need to look at the sustainability not just of individual sites, but of our network of services as a whole.

**Travel time**

![Travel time map]

This option performs relatively well on travel times with 98% of the population living within a 60 minute travel time to one of the HASU sites. The maximum travel time is 75 minutes. As with option one, we need to consider this performance in the context of the impact measures such as an air ambulance could have on travel times within other configurations which may offer a more sustainable platform for improved outcomes.
Sustainability
As outlined in more detail under option B, the main issues with the initial four HASU model are admissions levels falling below recommended levels at two of the four sites, with a potential impact on the opportunity available to staff on those sites to develop and maintain specialist skills.

The main issues for a 3 HASU model, as outlined in more detail under option F, are that admissions at Royal Victoria would be above the recommended level.

The main strength of the phased approach within this option is the additional flexibility it offers in allowing time to maximise capacity at the Royal Victoria site to cope with 1,600 admissions, while ensuring that people have access to high quality, sustainable stroke services in the interim.

With services withdrawn from the Antrim site, Altnagelvin sees a significant increase in admission levels which increase from 434 to 520, bringing Altnagelvin closer to the recommended level of admissions.

**Estimated Annual Admissions**
**Travel time**
Under this phased approach, 94% of the population lives within 60 minutes of one of the four HASU sites. This is reduced to 93% when the HASU sites are reduced to three.

As outlined in the chart below, travel times are only marginally affected by this phased approach.

**Estimated Travel Time**
Sustainability
As outlined in more detail under option C, the main issue for this 4 HASU model is that none of the four sites have admissions levels within recommended levels.

Subsequently reducing to three HASUs results in increased admissions to both Craigavon (which then falls within the recommended levels) and Altnagelvin which nonetheless continues to fall below the minimum recommended level.

The phased approach within this option has no impact on the Royal Victoria which sees admission levels of 1,613 under both the four and three HASU configuration. This phased approach does not allow for additional time to maximise capacity on the Royal Victoria site as the presence of a HASU at the South West Acute Hospital has no impact on admissions at Royal Victoria.
**Travel time**

Under this phased approach the percentage of the population living within 60 minutes of a HASU falls from 98% with four HASUs to 93% with three HASUs. Maximum travel time increases from 75 minutes to 106 minutes.

In this context, the availability of an air ambulance for stroke patients is an important consideration in considering the potential to address excess travel time for those affected.

---

**Estimated Travel Time**

![Estimated Travel Time Chart]

- **Recommended**
- **Mean**
- **95th Percentile**
- **Maximum**
**Sustainability**

This option sees two of the three HASU sites with estimated admission levels which fall outside the recommended level.

Altnagelvin would see 520 admissions, just below the recommended minimum level, while the Royal Victoria would see 1,613 admissions, just above the recommended maximum level.

However, while falling beneath the recommended minimum level, Altnagelvin would see its highest level of admissions under this option, suggesting that this is the best option for maintaining a sustainable service on the Altnagelvin site.

It is recognised that while the volume of admissions at Royal Victoria would provide a strong opportunity for the development and maintenance of specialist expertise additional measures may be required to support staff at the Royal Victoria to ensure that the levels of admission did not become overwhelming and reduce the potential for improved outcomes.

It is also recognised that the delivery of this option is dependent on the necessary capacity being secured on the Royal Victoria site.

**Estimated Annual Admissions**

![Graph showing estimated annual admissions for Royal Victoria, Craigavon, and Altnagelvin]

- **HASU Admissions**
- Below Recommended Levels
- Recommended Levels
- HASU Admissions
Travel time

This option is the poorest performing option in terms of travel time, with 93% of the population living within 60 minutes of one of the three HASU sites. The maximum travel time is almost 120 minutes.

In this context, the availability of an air ambulance for stroke patients is an important consideration in considering the potential to address excess travel time for those affected.
ABOUT THESE OPTIONS:

Establishing a network of HASUs and ASUs will have an impact on other services discussed in this document. This will include existing stroke wards and non-acute hospital wards currently providing rehabilitation and support.

The order is not a ranking and we are not identifying a preferred option until we have fully considered your views and feedback alongside the available evidence.

Change will not happen overnight; the final model will be implemented in a phased approach over 24 months, reflecting the complexities and co-dependences with other services required to ensure effective stroke services.

None of these options are about saving money; all of these reconfiguration options will see significant additional investment in stroke services.

Equality Screening
In accordance with guidance produced by the Equality Commission for NI and in keeping with Section 75 of the NI Act 1998, the proposed options have been equality screened and a preliminary decision has been taken that a full equality impact assessment is not required at this stage. The preliminary decision is subject to change following analysis of feedback received during the consultation.

Rural Proofing
Rural proofing is a process that aims to make sure that Government policies are carefully and objectively examined to make sure they treat those in rural areas fairly and to make public services available in a fair way, no matter where people live in NI. Where necessary, policy adjustments might be made to reflect rural needs and in particular to ensure that as far as possible public services are accessible on a fair basis to the rural community. Throughout the consultation process, careful consideration will be given to the needs of rural communities.

Regulatory Impact Assessment
Any requirement for a Regulatory Impact Assessment will be revisited when there is more clarity on a preferred option as an outcome of this consultation exercise.
GET INVOLVED

You can share your views on reshaping stroke services in a number of ways. Our website [www.health-ni.gov.uk/consultations/reshaping-stroke-care](http://www.health-ni.gov.uk/consultations/reshaping-stroke-care) provides full details of the consultation, including panel meetings and ways to get in touch.

You can send in your answers to the questions in this consultation paper, and comments on the issues, either by post or by email, to:

**Reshaping Stroke Services**  
**Department of Health**  
**Annexe 3**  
**Castle Buildings**  
**Stormont Estate**  
**Belfast BT4 3SQ**

**Email:** StrokeConsultation@health-ni.gov.uk  
**Telephone:** 028 9076 5643

A separate questionnaire is available to help you to record your comments and views, and can be downloaded on the [Department’s website](http://www.health-ni.gov.uk/consultations/reshaping-stroke-care).

You can also respond to the issues using our online questionnaire, which can be accessed at the following [website](http://www.health-ni.gov.uk/consultations/reshaping-stroke-care).

Or you can also request a meeting with a panel of experts in your local area to ask questions about the proposals and share your views in person. Further details of events in your area are available [here](http://www.health-ni.gov.uk/consultations/reshaping-stroke-care).

This document is also available in alternative formats on request. Please contact the Department, at the address above or by phoning 028 9076 5643, to make your request.

The consultation closes at 5pm on 18th June.
SUMMARY OF QUESTIONS

Questions

1. Do you agree that stroke patients should be admitted as soon as possible to specialist centres to deliver the best possible outcomes?

2. Do you agree that, to deliver an effective service, staff need the opportunity to build and develop their specialist expertise?

3. Do you agree that delivering better outcomes should take priority over additional travel time?

4. Would the availability of additional measures such as the availability of an air ambulance address your concerns about additional travel time?

5. Which of the options do you think delivers the maximum benefit for stroke patients in NI?

6. Are there additional options that we have not considered?
CONFIDENTIALITY AND ACCESS TO INFORMATION

The Department may publish a summary of responses following completion of the consultation process. Your response, and all other responses to the consultation, may be published or disclosed on request in accordance with information legislation; these chiefly being the Freedom of Information Act 2000 (FOIA), the Environmental Information Regulations 2004 (EIR), the Data Protection Act 1998 (DPA) and the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) (EU) 2016/679. The Department can only refuse to disclose information in exceptional circumstances. Before you submit your response, please read the paragraphs below on the confidentiality of consultations and they will give you guidance on the legal position about any information given by you in response to this consultation.

The FOIA gives the public a right of access to any information held by a public authority, namely, the Department in this case. This right of access to information includes information provided in response to a consultation. The Department cannot automatically consider as confidential information supplied to it in response to a consultation. However, it does have the responsibility to decide whether any information provided by you in response to this consultation, including information about your identity should be made public or be treated as confidential.

If you do not wish information about your identity to be made public please include an explanation in your response. Being transparent and providing accessible information to individuals about how we may use personal data is a key element of the DPA and the General Data Protection Regulation (EU) 2016/679. The Department is committed to building trust and confidence in our ability to process personal information. This means that information provided by you in response to the consultation is unlikely to be treated as confidential, except in very particular circumstances.

For further information about confidentiality of responses please contact the Information Commissioner’s Office on 0303 123 1113 or via https://ico.org.uk/global/contact-us/

NB. Please note that the Department is unable to respond individually to responses; however, a summary of all consultation responses will be published after the close of the consultation period.
NEXT STEPS

Following the public consultation, a consultation analysis report will be prepared to inform the identification of a preferred option.

This preferred option will then be subject to an Equality Impact Assessment alongside further consideration of the impact on rural communities.

Implementation of the preferred model is subject to the development and approval of relevant business cases.
D-DAY COMMEMORATION CONCERT – 8 JUN 2019

The year 2019 will be marked by ABF The Soldiers’ Charity’s 75th Anniversary, which also coincides with the 75th Anniversary of the OPERATION OVERLORD. We will commemorate both occasions with our own unique Flagship Concert at the Belfast Waterfront. ‘D-DAY 75 – a Musical Commemoration of Ulster’s Contribution to the Normandy Landings’ will take place on Saturday 8th June 2019 at 8pm and will be a showcase of Northern Ireland’s talent. The Guest of Honour will be Mrs Fionnuala Jay-O’Boyle, Her Majesty’s Lord-Lieutenant of the City of Belfast. All proceeds from the show will go to help support soldiers, veterans and their families in times of need.

Notwithstanding local elections, we would like to invite Councillors and Staff from your authority to join us, as we travel back to the year 1944 in wartime Northern Ireland Garrison and hear tales of Ulster’s brave soldiers as they prepare to assault Nazi occupied France, by both sea and air.

The evening, which promises to be a ‘sell-out’ event, will be hosted by popular News Anchor, Pamela Ballantine and will feature the Band, Bugles, Pipes and Drums of the Royal Irish Regiment, plus a number of other well-known local artistes performing popular music, songs and re-enactments from the 1940s era.

This should be a fantastic evening out. VIP Tickets are £48pp and will include top show seats, entry to a pre-show VIP reception and interval drinks and nibbles. Should your authority be able to accept, please let me know soonest and I will ensure that places are reserved and further details are sent out to you in due course. Spaces may be booked in advance for Council representation at the event and allocated later based on results of the election.

Best wishes,

David Forsey
Regional Director (NI)
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Members will be aware that on the 26th August 2015 Council delegated authority to the Ards and North Down Sports Forum Borough, in order to allow it to administer sports grants funding on behalf of the Council. £25,000 had been allocated within the 2018/2019 revenue budget for this purpose.

The Council further authorised the Forum under delegated powers to award grants of up to £250. Grants above £250 still require Council approval. In addition, the Council requested that regular updates are reported to members.

During March 2019, the Forum received a total of 20 grant applications; 6 of which were for Travel and Accommodation, 7 of which were for Equipment, 4 of which were for Coaching and 3 of which were for Gold Cards. A summary of the applications are detailed in the attached Appendix 1 March 2019.
A total of 1 of the applications failed to meet the specified criteria. The reasons for the unsuccessful application are detailed on the attached Appendix 2, Unsuccessful Sports Forum Grants March 2019.

For information, the annual budget and spend to date on grant categories is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Annual Budget</th>
<th>Funding Awarded March 2019</th>
<th>Remaining Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Travel and Accommodation*</td>
<td>£12,000</td>
<td>£480</td>
<td>-£2,328.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coaching*</td>
<td>£2,500</td>
<td>£1,150</td>
<td>-£1,542.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment*</td>
<td>£5,000</td>
<td>£5,542.55</td>
<td>-£5,274.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Events*</td>
<td>£3,000</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td>-£442.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeding</td>
<td>£500</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td>£250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anniversary</td>
<td>£1,000</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td>£1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discretionary</td>
<td>£1,000</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td>£880</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Gold Cards Issued during the period March 2019 is 2.

* The proposed remaining budget for Travel & Accommodation of -£2,328.37 is based on a proposed award of £480 with withdrawn funds of £120 as listed in Appendix 1(A). The proposed remaining budget for Equipment of -£5,274.66 is based on a proposed award of £5,542.55 as outlined in Appendix 1(B). The proposed remaining budget for Coaching of -£1,542.00 is based on an award of £1,150 with withdrawn funds of £202.50 as outlined in Appendix 1(C). The proposed remaining budget for Events of -£442.45 is based on withdrawn funds of £500 as outlined in Appendix 1(D).

**RECOMMENDATION**

It is recommended that Council approves the attached applications for financial assistance for sporting purposes valued at above £250, and that the applications approved by the forum (valued at below £250) are noted.

(As agreed by Council any applications which met the guidelines for the remainder of the 2018/2019 year are honoured as funds can be reallocated from other areas of underspend from the Councils Leisure budget.)
Appendix1 - Sport Forum Applications for Noting and Approval March 2019

(A) Traveling and Accommodation (for noting)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Type of Grant</th>
<th>Representing</th>
<th>Sport</th>
<th>Competition</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Date(s) of Competition</th>
<th>Amount Recommended</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Stephen Hamill</td>
<td>Travel/Accommodation</td>
<td>Ireland U18</td>
<td>Hockey</td>
<td>Ireland U18 vs England U18</td>
<td>Lillleshall, England</td>
<td>20th-23rd February 2019</td>
<td>£100</td>
<td>Max Award for Travel within UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Bryn Dickson</td>
<td>Travel/Accommodation</td>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>Inline Hockey</td>
<td>Sparta Cup</td>
<td>Barcelona, Spain</td>
<td>17th-21st April 2019</td>
<td>£120</td>
<td>Max Award Travel within Europe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Dan McGaughey</td>
<td>Travel/Accommodation</td>
<td>Northern Ireland</td>
<td>Sailing</td>
<td>World/European Qualifier 4</td>
<td>Weymouth, England</td>
<td>9th + 10th March 2019</td>
<td>£60</td>
<td>Max funding available due to funding limit of £500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Dan McGaughey</td>
<td>Travel/Accommodation</td>
<td>Northern Ireland</td>
<td>Sailing</td>
<td>World/European Qualifier 6</td>
<td>Weymouth, England</td>
<td>23rd + 24th March 2019</td>
<td>Unsuccessful – see appendix 2</td>
<td>Reached £500 funding limit for this financial year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Charlotte Keers</td>
<td>Travel/Accommodation</td>
<td>Northern Ireland</td>
<td>Horse Riding – Triathlon</td>
<td>Pony Club Winter Triathlon Finals</td>
<td>Milton Keynes</td>
<td>31st March 2019</td>
<td>£100</td>
<td>Max Award Travel within the UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Lauren Taylor</td>
<td>Travel/Accommodation</td>
<td>Northern Ireland</td>
<td>Horse Riding – Triathlon</td>
<td>Pony Club Winter Triathlon Finals</td>
<td>Milton Keynes</td>
<td>31st March 2019</td>
<td>£100</td>
<td>Max Award Travel within the UK</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: £480

A) Withdrawn Travel/Accommodation costs (for noting)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Type of Grant</th>
<th>Representing</th>
<th>Sport</th>
<th>Competition</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Date(s) of Competition</th>
<th>Amount Awarded</th>
<th>Amount withdrawn</th>
<th>Reason withdrawn</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aaron Wightman</td>
<td>Travel/Accommodation</td>
<td>N. Ireland</td>
<td>Football</td>
<td>Albir Cup</td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>1st-10th December 2018</td>
<td>£120</td>
<td>£120</td>
<td>Receipts not returned</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: £120
### (B) Equipment Costs (For Noting)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Club</th>
<th>Type of Grant</th>
<th>Description of Project</th>
<th>Funding Description</th>
<th>Amount Requested</th>
<th>Proposed amount</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7. Belfast Kayak Club</td>
<td>Equipment Grant</td>
<td>Equipment to help host events and for training</td>
<td>48 Tabards: £244.80</td>
<td>£244.80</td>
<td>£244.80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td><strong>£244.80</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### (B) Equipment Costs (For Approving)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Club</th>
<th>Type of Grant</th>
<th>Description of Project</th>
<th>Funding Description</th>
<th>Amount Requested</th>
<th>Proposed amount</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 8. Holywood Ladies Bowling Club    | Equipment Grant | New equipment to comply with International Rules                 | 6 Outdoor Jacks: £72  
1 Self retracting Tape: £50  
4 Deluxe Scoreboards: £400  
6 Scorecards Holders: £60  
6 Bowls Gatherers: £250  
8 White rink pins: £50  
4 Packs of ballot discs: £16  
20 White Chalk Sprays: £80 | £978            | £978             | Maximum Award                       |
| 9. Bangor Swifts Juniors Fc        | Equipment Grant | New goals to help host events and new training equipment.       | 16ft x 7ft Metal Goals: £700  
12ft x 6ft Metal Goals: £530  
40 Size 3 and 4 Footballs: £250  
Bibs and Cones: £100 | £1,580          | £1,000           |                                      |
| 10. Belfast Kayak Club             | Equipment Grant | Equipment to help host events and for training                  | 140 Tabards: £714  
Postage and Packaging: £10  
3 Silva Deck Compasses: £150  
5 Hand Held Compasses: £125 | £999            | £754.20          | Deducted £244.80 (no. 7 above) to stay within £1,000 limit |
### Equipment Costs Continued (For Approving)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Club</th>
<th>Type of Grant</th>
<th>Description of Project</th>
<th>Funding Description</th>
<th>Amount Requested</th>
<th>Proposed amount</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11. Lough Cuan Bowmen</td>
<td>Equipment Grant</td>
<td>Equipment to help host events</td>
<td>24 x QT19 Longshot layered foam target butts 95cm @£85 each</td>
<td>£2,040</td>
<td>£1,000</td>
<td>Maximum Award</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 12. Bangor Swimming Club| Equipment Grant | Training Equipment and High-Performance Equipment (Wearable Stroke Monitoring System)  | Triton Connect (Communication Hub) £299  
Triton Unit (Wearable Device) £299  
Software: £300  
Shipping: £67.55 | £965.55           | £965.55         |              |
| 13. Bryansburn Ranges FC| Equipment Grant | Equipment to help host events and Training Equipment                                   | £300: Line Marker  
£300: 2 Sets of Nets | £600              | £600           |              |

**Total:** £5,297.75
### C) Coaching Grants (for approving)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Club</th>
<th>Type of Grant</th>
<th>Coaching description</th>
<th>Date of Event(s)</th>
<th>Amount requested</th>
<th>Proposed amount</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14. Royal North Ireland Yacht Club</td>
<td>Coaching Grant</td>
<td>Advanced Powerboat Qualification</td>
<td>2nd-3rd April 2019</td>
<td>£375</td>
<td>£300</td>
<td>Up to 75% of costs to a maximum of £300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Ward Park Runners</td>
<td>Coaching Grant</td>
<td>Coaching Qualifications – 4 LIRF’s</td>
<td>26th January 2019</td>
<td>£440</td>
<td>£300</td>
<td>Up to 75% of costs to a maximum of £300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Bangor Swifts Juniors</td>
<td>Coaching Grant</td>
<td>7 x Grassroots Awards 2 x IFA Level 1s</td>
<td>30th January 2019 3rd, 10th and 24th February 2019</td>
<td>£550</td>
<td>£300</td>
<td>Up to 75% of costs to a maximum of £300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total:** £900

### C) Coaching Grants (for noting)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Club</th>
<th>Type of Grant</th>
<th>Coaching description</th>
<th>Date of Event(s)</th>
<th>Amount requested</th>
<th>Proposed amount</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17. Belfast Kayak Club</td>
<td>Coaching Grant</td>
<td>3 x Paddle sport Instructor Awards</td>
<td>16th and 17th March 2019</td>
<td>£250</td>
<td>£250</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total:** £250

### C) Withdrawn Coaching costs (for noting)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Club</th>
<th>Type of Grant</th>
<th>Coaching description</th>
<th>Date of Event(s)</th>
<th>Amount Awarded</th>
<th>Amount Withdrawn</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Royal North of Ireland Yacht Club</td>
<td>Coaching Grant</td>
<td>Specialist Coaching</td>
<td>3rd February 2019</td>
<td>£101.25</td>
<td>£101.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royal North of Ireland Yacht Club</td>
<td>Coaching Grant</td>
<td>Specialist Coaching</td>
<td>6th January 2019</td>
<td>£101.25</td>
<td>£101.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total:** £202.50
D) Withdrawn Event Costs (for noting)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Club</th>
<th>Type of Grant</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
<th>Date of Event(s)</th>
<th>Amount Awarded</th>
<th>Amount Withdrawn</th>
<th>Reason Withdrawn</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bangor Ju-Jitsu Club</td>
<td>Coaching Grant</td>
<td>2-day International Ju Jitsu Course</td>
<td>11&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; November 2019</td>
<td>£500</td>
<td>£500</td>
<td>Receipts not returned</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total: £500**
## Gold Card Grants

(No cost to Council or Northern Community Leisure Trust to provide access to facilities)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Type of Grant</th>
<th>Training Venue</th>
<th>Representing</th>
<th>Competition</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Date(s) of Competition</th>
<th>Recommended</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19. Michael Robson</td>
<td>Gold Card</td>
<td>Bangor Sportsplex and Queens</td>
<td>Ireland – Hockey</td>
<td>European Championships</td>
<td>Antwerp, Belgium</td>
<td>18th-25th August 2019</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Callum O'Hanlon</td>
<td>Gold Card</td>
<td>Portaferry, Ards BMWLC and Aurora</td>
<td>Ulster U18s – Rugby</td>
<td>U18s vs Munster</td>
<td>Cork, Ireland</td>
<td>25th May 2019</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 2 - Unsuccessful Sports Forum Grants March 2019

Unsuccessful Sports Forum Applications March 2019

During March 2019, 1 application submitted failed to meet the specified criteria.

1. Dan McGaughey – applied for a Travel/Accommodation grant through the Ards and North Down Sports Forum Grant Scheme. Dan is competing at the World/European Qualifier 6 on the 23rd and 24th March. As outlined in our guidelines, we will not fund more than £500 for individual travel grants within any one financial year. Dan has reached his funding limit for 2018/19 as he has now been awarded £500 across 5 applications. The forum therefore recommends not to fund this application.
**ITEM 11**

**Ards and North Down Borough Council**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Report Classification</th>
<th>Unclassified</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Council/Committee</td>
<td>Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Meeting</td>
<td>24 April 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Director</td>
<td>Director of Community and Wellbeing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Head of Service</td>
<td>Head of Leisure and Amenities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Report</td>
<td>09 April 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>File Reference</td>
<td>CG11101A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislation</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 75 Compliant</td>
<td>Yes ☒ No ☐ Other ☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If other, please add comment below:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>In Bloom Funding 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attachments</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In order to support local community groups with providing floral displays in their respective areas, the Council recently placed an advert in the local press inviting groups to apply for In Bloom funding.

The following applications have been received:

- **Helens Bay and Crawfordsburn Residents Association**
  £450 requested for the completion of floral and environmental work within the Helens Bay and Crawfordsburn village area. This funding represents 78% of the project costs which includes insurance cover costs.

- **Ballywalter Community Action Group**
  £990 requested for continued planting in the Peace and Memorial Garden in Ballywalter. This funding applies to 100% of project. Insurance cover is in place.
• **Millisle and District Community Association**  
  £1000 requested for hanging baskets and planters to be positioned along the Main St of the village. This funding applies to 71% of the total project. The additional funds for the project are being provided by the group. Insurance cover is in place.

• **Groomsport Village Association**  
  £1000 requested for continued floral development along the main thoroughfare of the village. This will build on constructive feedback from Ulster In-Bloom judges last season. The funding represents 77% of project. Insurance cover is in place.

• **Portaferry In Bloom**  
  £1000 requested for continued planting and maintenance in Portaferry. This funding applies to 100% of project. Additional request for £135.00 insurance grant has been submitted.

• **Ballygowan and District Community Association**  
  £156 requested to plant raised planters at the front of Ballygowan Community Centre. This funding applies to 100% of the project. Insurance cover is in place.

• **Comber Regeneration**  
  £1000 requested to carry out replanting of the Glen Link gateway area, town centre planters and new area on the Newtownards Road entrance. This funding applies to 100% of the project. Insurance cover is in place.

• **Millisle Health and Wellbeing Group**  
  £1000 requested for the provision of flowers and planters in the communal areas within the local area. This funding applies to 100% of the project. Insurance cover is in place.

• **Bangor Alternatives**  
  £1000 requested for the construction of a dialogue garden within the Community Allotment facility in Kilcooley. This funding applies to 100% of the project. Insurance cover is in place.

• **Cloughy and District Community Association**  
  £1000 requested for a project of environmental improvement planting along Main Road. This funding applies to 94% of the overall scheme. Insurance cover is in place.

• **Portavogie Regeneration Forum**  
  £1000 for an inter-generational project aimed at the local primary school planting containers for the school, businesses and elderly home owners. This funding applies to 100% of the project. Insurance cover is in place.
• **Lisbarnett and Lisbane Community Association**  
  £1000 requested to carry out planting in baskets and containers at the Community Centre. This funding applies to 100% of the project. Insurance cover is in place.

• **Rathgill Community Association**  
  £1000 requested to plant out hanging baskets for use in the Rathgill Estate. This funding applies to 100% of the project. Insurance cover is in place.

• **Seaheaven Community Group**  
  £500 requested to carry out planting of baskets and planters in the Seaheaven Development in Groomsport. This funding applies to 70% of the project. Insurance cover is in place.

The funding applications received amount to £12,096 and the insurance grants amount to £135.

Members are advised that two applications were received after the closing date and under the terms of the In-Bloom Policy cannot be considered for funding.

The budget provision for the In-Bloom Funding initiative is £15,000. The representative projects enable the Parks team to further enhance the appearance of the towns and villages in a sustainable manner with excellent community buy in.

It should be pointed out that funding is dependent upon the submission of all appropriate receipts and therefore the total funding allocation may not be attained for some of the projects if the criteria relating to this is not adhered to.

**RECOMMENDATION**

It is recommended that Council approve the above applications and funding is allocated accordingly.
Ards and North Down Borough Council

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Report Classification</th>
<th>Unclassified</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Council/Committee</td>
<td>Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Meeting</td>
<td>24 April 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Director</td>
<td>Director of Community and Wellbeing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Head of Service</td>
<td>Head of Community and Culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Report</td>
<td>03 April 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>File Reference</td>
<td>CDV28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislation</td>
<td>Recreation and Youth Services Order (NI) 1986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 75 Compliant</td>
<td>Yes ☒ No ☐ Other ☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If other, please add comment below:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>Community Development Grants Assessment 2019-2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attachments</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Community Development (CD) Fund 2019/20 is supported by the Community Support Programme from Department for Communities and the Council’s Community Development Section. The Letter of Offer from the Department for Communities has been received and a total budget of £96,083.00 is available for the current year.

The Community Development Fund is split in two categories 1) running costs up to £2000, 2) project costs up to £1000. Those who are eligible, can apply for either category or both.

The grants were open for five weeks to allow applicants enough time to gather the necessary documentation and information to support their applications.

The objectives of the CD Fund are to strengthen local communities: to increase community participation; to promote social inclusion through the stimulation and support of community groups; and to encourage and promote community activity.

The expected outcomes for the CD Fund were:
- An active and organised community
- An influential community
- An informed community
- A sustainable community.

There were 70 applications received for running costs and 31 applications received for project costs, with a total amount of £145,667.26 being requested. The amount of applications has significantly increased from last year from 58 to 70 for running costs.

An assessment panel comprised of the Community Development Manager, Community Development Officer, Neighbourhood Environment Administration and Data Protection Officer assessed and scored the grants under the following criteria:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grant Criteria – Running Costs</th>
<th>Max Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Purpose and Aim</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefit to the community</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainable Communities</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value for money</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grant Criteria – Project Costs</th>
<th>Max Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Purpose and Aim</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location, Need and benefit</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcomes, impacts &amp; benefits</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tackling poverty &amp; social inclusion</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage and Promote health &amp; wellbeing</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equality Scoring Criteria</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value for money</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A 20% weighting had been applied to:

i) applicants located in the top 10% of the most deprived wards in the Council area, (using the DfC Recommended Weighting) and

ii) those that specifically targeted socially excluded groups.

Out of the 70 applications for running costs 48 were successful, 18 did not meet the pass mark of 40% and 4 were deemed ineligible (see table below).

From the 31 applications for project costs 12 were successful, 12 didn’t meet the pass mark of 40% and 7 were deemed ineligible (see table below).

As in previous years the funding programme had been oversubscribed, however in-line with current budgets a recommendation of 100% of the approved grant be awarded to all successful applicants, with a total value of £92,389.80.
For those applicants who were unsuccessful, the Community Development Team are available to help and support with sourcing and completing other funding applications.

Table of applicants and score –

### Running Costs -

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Group</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Eligible Amount</th>
<th>Amount awarded 100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 55+ Holywood Club</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>£2,000.00</td>
<td>£2,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Ards Peninsula Villages Partnership</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>£1,500.00</td>
<td>£1,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Ballygowan &amp; District Community Ass</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>£530.70</td>
<td>£530.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Ballyhalbert Community association</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>£2,000.00</td>
<td>£2,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Ballyphilip Youth Club</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>£2,000.00</td>
<td>£2,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Ballywalter &amp; District Historical Society</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>£570.00</td>
<td>£570.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Ballywalter Community Action Group</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>£590.00</td>
<td>£590.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Ballywalter Youth &amp; Community Co-op</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>£2,000.00</td>
<td>£2,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Bees Nees Early Years Centre</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>£2,000.00</td>
<td>£2,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Bloomfield Community Association</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>£2,000.00</td>
<td>£2,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Cloughey &amp; District Community Association</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>£1,970.00</td>
<td>£1,970.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Comber Regeneration Community Partnership</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>£1,995.00</td>
<td>£1,995.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Comber Youth for Christ - The Net</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>£2,000.00</td>
<td>£2,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Conlig Community Regeneration Group</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>£1,596.00</td>
<td>£1,596.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Decorum NI</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>£2,000.00</td>
<td>£2,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Donaghadee Youth for Christ</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>£2,000.00</td>
<td>£2,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Donaghadee Community Development Association</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>£2,000.00</td>
<td>£2,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Donaghadee Heritage Preservation Company</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>£2,000.00</td>
<td>£2,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Friends of Ballymacormick Plantation</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>£970.00</td>
<td>£970.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Friends of the Abbey PTA</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>£1,000.00</td>
<td>£1,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Greyabbey and District Community Ass</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>£635.00</td>
<td>£635.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Greyabbey Village Hall Management Committee</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>£2,000.00</td>
<td>£2,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Groomsport Village Association</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>£1,900.00</td>
<td>£1,900.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Holywood Family Trust</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>£2,000.00</td>
<td>£2,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Holywood Residents’ Association</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>£2,000.00</td>
<td>£2,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 Holywood Shared Town</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>£2,000.00</td>
<td>£2,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 Home start Ards, Comber and Peninsula Area</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>£2,000.00</td>
<td>£2,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 Kilcooley Community Action Group</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>£1,710.00</td>
<td>£1,710.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 Kilcooley Women’s Centre</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>£2,000.00</td>
<td>£2,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Killinchy &amp; District Community Dev Ass</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>£2,000.00</td>
<td>£2,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 Killinchy After Schools Club</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>£2,000.00</td>
<td>£2,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 Lisburnett and Lisbane Community Ass</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>£2,000.00</td>
<td>£2,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 Little Doves Childcare Centre</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>£2,000.00</td>
<td>£2,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 Millisle Regeneration</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>£2,000.00</td>
<td>£2,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 Millisle Youth Forum</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>£2,000.00</td>
<td>£2,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 Neurodiversity UK</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>£2,000.00</td>
<td>£2,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Group</td>
<td>Reason why it didn't pass</td>
<td>Score %</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49 1st Bangor Scout Group</td>
<td>lack of detail throughout the application</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 1st Holywood Scout Group</td>
<td>lack of detail throughout the application</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 Ballygowan Ulster Scots Association</td>
<td>lack of detail throughout the application</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52 Breezemount Community Association</td>
<td>lack of detail throughout the application</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53 Clandeboye Village Association</td>
<td>lack of detail throughout the application</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54 Head Peace CIC</td>
<td>lack of detail throughout the application</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 Kilcooley Over 50's Club</td>
<td>lack of detail throughout the application</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56 Millisle District Community Ass</td>
<td>lack of detail throughout the application</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57 Millisle Health &amp; Wellbeing Group</td>
<td>lack of detail throughout the application</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58 Playaway Childcare Centre</td>
<td>lack of detail throughout the application</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59 Polish Association Bangor</td>
<td>lack of detail throughout the application</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 Portaferry In Bloom</td>
<td>lack of detail throughout the application</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61 Scrabo Badgers</td>
<td>lack of detail throughout the application</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62 St Johns Ambulance</td>
<td>lack of detail throughout the application</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63 St Johns Ambulance Dufferin Avenue Cadets</td>
<td>lack of detail throughout the application</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64 The Link Family and Community Centre</td>
<td>lack of detail throughout the application</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 Tuesday Club</td>
<td>lack of detail throughout the application</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66 United Parish of Killinchy Kilmood and Tullynakill</td>
<td>lack of detail throughout the application</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Name of Group** | **Reason why it was excluded** | **Score %**

<p>| 67 Portaferry Coastal Rowing Club | excluded - sports club          | 0%      |
| 68 S.P.O.R.T.S Suicide Prevention Offering Recovery Through Sport | excluded - sports organisation | 0%      |
| 69 The Peninsula Choir            | excluded - commercial           | 0%      |
| 70 Bangor Scottish Dancing Group  | application form not completed  | 0%      |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Name of Group</th>
<th>Name of Project</th>
<th>Brief Description</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Eligible amount</th>
<th>Amount awarded 100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>55+ Holywood Club</td>
<td>Back in the day</td>
<td>Fees for Ulster Museum, coach hire, workshop</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>£626.00</td>
<td>£626.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Ballygovan Presbyterian Church - youth</td>
<td>Ballygovan Youth Club - Widening Participation Evenings</td>
<td>Practical activities - life skills, sports sessions, outdoor learning</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>£1,000.00</td>
<td>£1,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Donaghadee Community Development Association</td>
<td>Donaghadee Lifeboats Celebration</td>
<td>Commemorate work of lifeboats since 1910</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>£1,000.00</td>
<td>£1,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Groomsport Village Association</td>
<td>SING!</td>
<td>Monthly Sing along sessions</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>£1,000.00</td>
<td>£1,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Hollywood Shared Town</td>
<td>Big Tea Events</td>
<td>public meeting events to build connections, shared spaces and networking plus getting ideas for Hollywood.</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>£1,000.00</td>
<td>£1,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Kilcooley Community Action Group</td>
<td>Kilcooley Cross Community Project</td>
<td>Facilitated workshops, diversionary activity, cinema</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>£972.00</td>
<td>£972.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Kilcooley Women’s Centre</td>
<td>WRAP - Welfare Reform Assistance Project</td>
<td>Digital Equipment for Surgery Hub</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>£1,000.00</td>
<td>£1,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Lisbarnett and Lisbane Community Ass</td>
<td>Moving Up</td>
<td>The transition from primary to post primary - self confidence</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>£1,000.00</td>
<td>£1,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Millisle Regeneration</td>
<td>Can’t Exercise-WILL Exercise - Fun and Lifestyle</td>
<td>Guest speakers, fitness class leader costs</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>£1,000.00</td>
<td>£1,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Northern Ireland Rare Disease Partnership</td>
<td>RARDTAC: Raising Awareness of Rare Diseases Throughout All Communities</td>
<td>Local awareness events</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>£990.00</td>
<td>£990.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Redburn Loughview Community Forum</td>
<td>Upskilling Community in Key skills in times of austerity</td>
<td>Various courses for volunteers to increase their skills</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>£990.00</td>
<td>£990.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Bees Nees Early Years Centre</td>
<td>Intergeneration within the Community Project 'engage together'</td>
<td>Resources for workshops, blackout adventure, staff</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>£1000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

£11,578.00
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not awarded - did meet 40%</th>
<th>Name of Project</th>
<th>Brief description</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Amount requested</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Bloomfield Community Association</td>
<td>Seniors Regeneration Group</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>£1000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Comber Regeneration Community Partnership</td>
<td>Community Garden, First Aid training, Volunteer training</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>£850.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Head Peace CIC</td>
<td>Head Peace Felters</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>£1000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Millisle Youth Forum</td>
<td>Improving employability</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>£1000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Millisle DCA</td>
<td>Millisle Men’s Shed</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>£1000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Millisle Health and Wellbeing</td>
<td>Millisle Here we Grow</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>£1000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Portaferry &amp; Strangford Trust</td>
<td>Exhibition - 1000 Years of Maritime History</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>£1000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Polish Association</td>
<td>Information Sessions on the settlement scheme</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>£1000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Portaferry in Bloom</td>
<td>Blooming Windows</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>£1000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>RECON Community Group</td>
<td>Between the lines</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>£1000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Redburn Parent &amp; Toddler Group</td>
<td>Exploring and caring for our Environment</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>£950.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Whitehill Community Association</td>
<td>Youth Matters</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>£1000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deemed not eligible</td>
<td>Name of Project</td>
<td>Brief Description</td>
<td>Reason why it was deemed not eligible</td>
<td>Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Ards Peninsula Villages Partnership</td>
<td>The Ards Peninsula Way</td>
<td>To add to the promotional DVD for the Peninsula by adding the summer festivals into it</td>
<td>Deemed to be a retrospective project</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 Ballygrainey Women's Institute</td>
<td>Bus Trip</td>
<td>Bus trip for the Women</td>
<td>Excluded – Bus trip</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 Conlig Community Regeneration Group</td>
<td>Conlig Seniors</td>
<td>Tackling social isolation - bus hire, admission fees, catering</td>
<td>Deemed to be a bus trip for a project that has already started - not a new project</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 Holywood Family Trust</td>
<td>Junior Leaders Development</td>
<td>Residential fees and bus hire</td>
<td>Excluded under criteria – residential</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 S.P.O.R.T.S – Suicide Prevention Offering Recovery Through Sport</td>
<td>Training Sessions</td>
<td>First aid, Safe Talk, Mental Health Awareness</td>
<td>Excluded – sports organisation</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 The Tuesday Club</td>
<td>Seniors</td>
<td>Application form incomplete</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 Decorum NI</td>
<td>Writing Class - Producing a book of short stories</td>
<td>Production of book</td>
<td>Excluded – for a project that has already started</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**RECOMMENDATION**

It is recommended that the Council approve the recommendations detailed in this report.
Ards and North Down Borough Council

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Report Classification</th>
<th>Unclassified</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Council/Committee</td>
<td>Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Meeting</td>
<td>24 April 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Director</td>
<td>Director of Community and Wellbeing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Head of Service</td>
<td>Head of Community and Culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Report</td>
<td>27 March 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>File Reference</td>
<td>CD 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislation</td>
<td>Recreation and Youth Services Order (NI) 1986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 75 Compliant</td>
<td>Yes ☒ No ☐ Other ☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If other, please add comment below:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>Community Festival Funding 2019-2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attachments</td>
<td>Appendix 1 - Assessment Panel Recommendations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Community Festivals Fund (CFF) is jointly provided by the Department for Communities (DfC) and the Council. The fund was established in recognition of the positive contribution that festivals can make to communities and to the local economy. The CFF has been divided into three categories:

- Local Festival; of up £1,000 for a local community festival that attracts up to 1500 attendees

- Neighbourhood Festival; up to a maximum of £4,000 attracting between 1,501 - 5,000 attendees from neighbouring areas/towns/villages

- Large Scale Festival; up to £15,000, at least three days in duration and attracting a minimum of 5000 attendees.

The total budget available for the fund is £65,000.
The Council invited applications for the 2019-20 Community Festival Fund with a closing date of Friday 15 March at 4.00pm.

In keeping with the success of the YouTube Guidance Video last year, replacing the traditional grant application workshops, this year over 80 hits were recorded.

By the closing date 39 applications were received requesting funding totalling £105,810.

The applications were assessed and scored by the Community Development Manager, Community Development Officer, Events Officer, and Community Development Administration Officer, using the following criteria.

**Grant Criteria - Local**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Max Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Promotes Equality</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tackling poverty and social exclusion</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotes cultural tradition</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Participation</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities to improve skills/training</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong sense of Community</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value for money</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>35</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Grant Criteria – Neighbourhood/Large**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Max Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aim and benefits to community</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need and demand for festival</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcomes and impacts</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotes cultural tradition</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equality / community cohesion</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tackling poverty and social exclusion</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourages participation / attendance</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities to improve skills / training</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value for money</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>45</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Festivals that included a commemorative element were also scored out of 5, with a total possible scoring of 40 (Local) 50 (Neighbourhood and Large).

A 20% weighting was applied to: i) applications for festivals taking place in the top 10% of the most deprived wards in the Council area, (using the DfC Weighting Tool) and ii) from festivals that specifically target those who are socially excluded.

The assessment panel agreed a pass mark for the Local Festivals of 35% (score 12.5) and a pass mark for the Neighbourhood and Large Festival of 40% (score 18). The marks were totalled and calculated as a percentage of 100.

There was a broad spectrum of applications received, some of which were very detailed and strong in meeting the DfC criteria and others were less so.
On the completion of the assessment process, the panel agreed that:

- Four local festivals were deemed ineligible as per the grant criteria, one was from a non-constituted group, one was a group from outside the borough and two had applied for Christmas Festivals, which are no longer eligible through the local Community Festival Fund scheme.
- Two local festival applications did not reach the pass mark of 35%. Both applications lacked detailed responses to some of the questions and therefore scored under the required pass mark.
- One Neighbourhood Festival application did not reach the pass mark of 40% and again this application did not provide sufficient detailed to be awarded a higher score in some categories and failed to meet the required pass mark.

Successful applications were classified into the three categories. The total funding requested from the 23 Local Festival applicants was £21,924, applications for 5 Neighbourhood Festivals totalled £17,760 and 4 Large Festivals requesting £45,500. On the completion of the assessment process the funding programme was oversubscribed with the value of successful applications totalling £85,184 which was greater than the available funding.

The Panel agreed that all funding awards should be based on the percentage of funding requested/ funding available up to amount, £72,062.00, which is over budget, however the additional awards can be met from the Community Development budget. As such, subject to Council approval successful applicants will be awarded the following:

- Local Festivals: 100% of the amount requested
- Neighbourhood Festivals: 80% of the requested amount.
- Large Festivals: 80% of the amount requested.

Appendix I lists the groups which applied, the recommended scores, the funds requested and the amount to be allocated based on the funds available. Four applications were deemed ineligible and three applications failed to meet the required pass mark.

### RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Council approves the assessment panel recommendations detailed in the attached table at appendix 1.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group / Organisation</th>
<th>Name of Festival</th>
<th>Amount Requested</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>% Score</th>
<th>Eligible Amount</th>
<th>awarded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Ballygowan Presbyterian Church</td>
<td>Fun Day</td>
<td>£1,000</td>
<td>16/35</td>
<td>46.0%</td>
<td>£1,000</td>
<td>£1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Ballywalter &amp; District Historical Society</td>
<td>Celebration of Ulster Scots Heritage</td>
<td>£840</td>
<td>21.6/35</td>
<td>62.0%</td>
<td>£840</td>
<td>£840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Ballywalter Bowling &amp; Recreation Club</td>
<td>Easter Fun Day</td>
<td>£1,000</td>
<td>16/35</td>
<td>46.0%</td>
<td>£1,000</td>
<td>£1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Bloomfield Community Association</td>
<td>Bloomfield Festival</td>
<td>£1,000</td>
<td>14/35</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>£1,000</td>
<td>£1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Cloughey &amp; District Community Association</td>
<td>Annual Fun Day</td>
<td>£1,000</td>
<td>14/35</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>£1,000</td>
<td>£1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Conlig Community Regeneration Group</td>
<td>Family Day, Ulster Scots Traditions</td>
<td>£520</td>
<td>16/35</td>
<td>46.0%</td>
<td>£520</td>
<td>£520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Glen Craig Integrated Primary School Parent Teacher Ass.</td>
<td>Community Summer Fayre</td>
<td>£1,000</td>
<td>14/35</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>£1,000</td>
<td>1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Groomsport Village Association</td>
<td>Community Festival</td>
<td>£1,000</td>
<td>20/35</td>
<td>57.0%</td>
<td>£1,000</td>
<td>£1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Kilcooley Women’s Centre</td>
<td>International Women’s Day Festival</td>
<td>£600</td>
<td>20/35</td>
<td>57.0%</td>
<td>£600</td>
<td>£600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Killinchy Parish Church</td>
<td>Livingston Days Festival</td>
<td>£1,000</td>
<td>15/40</td>
<td>38.0%</td>
<td>£1,000</td>
<td>£1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Kircubbin &amp; District Community Association</td>
<td>Summer Festival</td>
<td>£1,000</td>
<td>24/35</td>
<td>69.0%</td>
<td>£1,000</td>
<td>£1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Londonderry Primary School PTA</td>
<td>Summer Fete</td>
<td>£1,000</td>
<td>16.2/35</td>
<td>57.0%</td>
<td>£1,000</td>
<td>£1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Millisle &amp; District Community Association</td>
<td>Series of events</td>
<td>£944</td>
<td>15/40</td>
<td>38.0%</td>
<td>£944</td>
<td>£944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Millisle Youth Forum</td>
<td>Sandcastle Extravaganza</td>
<td>£1,000</td>
<td>20/35</td>
<td>57.0%</td>
<td>£1,000</td>
<td>1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Parent Teacher and Friends of St Columba’s</td>
<td>Special Community Festival</td>
<td>£1,000</td>
<td>19/35</td>
<td>54.0%</td>
<td>£1,000</td>
<td>£1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Portaferry &amp; Strangford Trust</td>
<td>Celebrating 1000 years of Maritime History</td>
<td>£1,000</td>
<td>16/35</td>
<td>46.0%</td>
<td>£1,000</td>
<td>£1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Portaferry Community Collective Ltd</td>
<td>St Patricks day Community Carnival</td>
<td>£1,000</td>
<td>21/35</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>£1,000</td>
<td>£1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Recon Community Group</td>
<td>Easter Festival/ fun day</td>
<td>£1,000</td>
<td>18/35</td>
<td>51.0%</td>
<td>£1,000</td>
<td>£1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 St. Mary’s Parent Support Group</td>
<td>Community Fun Night</td>
<td>£750</td>
<td>16/35</td>
<td>46.0%</td>
<td>£750</td>
<td>£750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Whitehill Community Association</td>
<td>Community Festival</td>
<td>£1,000</td>
<td>15/35</td>
<td>43.0%</td>
<td>£1,000</td>
<td>£1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Lisbane and Lisbarnett</td>
<td>Community Fun Night</td>
<td>£1,000</td>
<td>20/35</td>
<td>57.0%</td>
<td>£1,000</td>
<td>£1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Ballygowan Ulster Scots Ass</td>
<td>Cultural Celebration</td>
<td>£800</td>
<td>18/35</td>
<td>51.0%</td>
<td>£800</td>
<td>£800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Ballygowan &amp; District Community Association</td>
<td>Ballygowan Festival Afternoon</td>
<td>£1,470</td>
<td>21/45</td>
<td>47.0%</td>
<td>£1,000</td>
<td>£1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>£21,924</td>
<td>£21,454</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| Neighbourhood                                                   |                                                              |                  |        |         |                 |         |
|                                                               |                                                              |                  |        |         | £21,924         | £21,454 | £21,454 |
| 24 Ards Peninsula Villages Partnership                          | Peninsula Kite Festival                                     | £3,210           | 22/45  | 49.0%   | £3,210          | £2,568.00 |
| 25 Donaghadee Community Partnership                             | Ulster-Scot talent                                         | £2,550           | 22/45  | 49.0%   | £2,550          | £2,040.00 |
| 26 Holywood &amp; District Community Council                        | Holywood May Fair                                          | £4,000           | 21/45  | 44.0%   | £4,000          | £3,200.00 |
| 27 Holywood Shared Town                                         | Holywood Culture Night                                     | £4,000           | 24/45  | 53.0%   | £4,000          | £3,200.00 |
| 28 Polish Association Bangor. Pl                               | Series of events                                           | £4,000           | 21/50  | 42.0%   | £4,000          | £3,200.00 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Organization Name</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
<th>Amount Requested</th>
<th>Amount Approved</th>
<th>% Approved</th>
<th>Amount Declined</th>
<th>Amount Requested</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Ards Development Bureau &amp; Community Network</td>
<td>Connecting Communities at Christmas - Fair in the Square</td>
<td>£10,500</td>
<td>£10,500</td>
<td>93.0%</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td>£17,760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Donaghadee Community Dev. Ass</td>
<td>Summer Festival</td>
<td>£15,000</td>
<td>£15,000</td>
<td>47.0%</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td>£17,760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Portaferry Gala Festival</td>
<td>Portaferry Gala Festival</td>
<td>£15,000</td>
<td>£15,000</td>
<td>51.0%</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td>£14,208.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Portaferry Sailing Club</td>
<td>Portaferry Sails &amp; Sounds Festival</td>
<td>£5,000</td>
<td>£5,000</td>
<td>64.0%</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td>£17,760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>£45,500</td>
<td>£45,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>£105,810.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Unsuccessful applicants - under pass mark**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Organization Name</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
<th>Amount Requested</th>
<th>Amount Approved</th>
<th>% Approved</th>
<th>Amount Declined</th>
<th>Amount Requested</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Friend of St. Patrick's Ballygalget (FOSP)</td>
<td>Annual Fun Fete</td>
<td>£1,000</td>
<td>Insufficient Info</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>£1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Friends of Abbey PTA</td>
<td>Community Fun Day</td>
<td>£3,600</td>
<td>Insufficient Info</td>
<td>29.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>£3,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>£4,600</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>£4,600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Neighbourhood**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Organization Name</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
<th>Amount Requested</th>
<th>Amount Approved</th>
<th>% Approved</th>
<th>Amount Declined</th>
<th>Amount Requested</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Comber Regeneration Community Partnership Ltd (CRCP)</td>
<td>Comber Earlies Fringe Festival</td>
<td>£12,026</td>
<td>Insufficient Info</td>
<td>22.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>£12,026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>£16,626</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>£16,626</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Deemed ineligible**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Organization Name</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
<th>Amount Requested</th>
<th>Amount Approved</th>
<th>% Approved</th>
<th>Amount Declined</th>
<th>Amount Requested</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Kilcooley Community Action Group</td>
<td>Christmas festival</td>
<td>£1,000</td>
<td>not eligible under criteria</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>£1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Clandeboye Village Community Association</td>
<td>Mid-Winter Christmas Festival</td>
<td>£1,000</td>
<td>not eligible under criteria</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>£1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Stoney falls</td>
<td></td>
<td>£1,000</td>
<td>Not a constituted group</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>£1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Mae Murray Foundation</td>
<td></td>
<td>£1,000</td>
<td>Not in the Borough</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>£1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>£4,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>£4,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL AMOUNT REQUESTED** £105,810.00
Ards and North Down Borough Council

<table>
<thead>
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<th>Report Classification</th>
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</tr>
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<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Council/Committee</td>
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<tr>
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<tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
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<td>Veterans’ Day 2019 and Proposal to Mark 75\textsuperscript{th} Anniversary of D-Day Landings</td>
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<tr>
<td>Attachments</td>
<td>Proposed design of new mosaic panel</td>
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</table>

**Veterans’ Day 2019**
Members may recall that a tentative date was set for Veterans’ Day 2019 in Newtownards of Saturday, 15 June 2019 at 6.00pm. The Council has since been informed that the military band which had been provisionally booked for the event will not now be available. As the band is a key element of the success of the Veterans’ parade and, as other bands would not be in a position to provide the focal spectacle of beating retreat, it is proposed that the date be changed to an evening in early September, subject to the availability of a suitable military band. Officers are currently in negotiations with the Royal Navy to secure the Band of the Royal Marines. The Royal British Legion and other relevant stakeholders have been notified and all are happy with the alternative arrangements. (The June event has not yet been publicised).

**Proposal to Mark 75\textsuperscript{th} Anniversary of D-Day Landings**
Members may recall, that at the Council meeting on 27 March 2019, the Council agreed to hold a modest event to mark the 75\textsuperscript{th} Anniversary of D-Day at Eisenhower...
Pier, Bangor, on Saturday, 8 June 2019, with the US Consul General in attendance as guest of honour.

It is proposed that the event takes the form of a solemn service of commemoration, followed by speeches and the unveiling of a new segment to the existing mosaic depicted below.

It is further proposed that a new panel, stretching the width of the existing mosaic, and filling the gap between the mosaic and the ground, be commissioned, to include a D-Day photographic montage on ceramic tiles, together with text marking the 75th Anniversary of the D-Day Landings.

A copy of the proposed mosaic is attached for approval. Officers are happy with the design subject to replacement of the image of Veterans parading being replaced by a Second World War era image. (This is because an image of people who are still alive would fall under the Data Protection Act 2018 and the consent of those pictured would be required).

The US Consul General Elizabeth Kennedy Trudeau will play a key role in the commemorative service, along with the Mayor and other guests (tbc).

Guests will be invited for afternoon tea at the Town Hall, The Castle, following the service.

**RECOMMENDATION**

It is recommended that the Council:

1. Agrees to reschedule Veterans’ Day 2019 to a suitable date in September.
2. Proceeds as described above to hold an event in Bangor to mark the 75\textsuperscript{th} Anniversary of D-Day, including the commissioning of a new segment to be added to the existing mosaic at Eisenhower Pier.
The Council has received a request from WSC Consulting on behalf of Crawfordsburn Construction Limited to connect to a watercourse on Council land at Crawfordsburn Glen Park (see attached site plan at appendix 1).

Crawfordsburn Construction Limited is constructing residential dwellings on the site of the former Crawfordsburn Country Club which is adjacent to Council land. The company had initially hoped to connect the storm drainage to the culvert within Main Street but due to structural issues within the culvert, DFI Roads refused this request. It is therefore seeking a wayleave suitable for construction of the works and maintenance and this in turn will be transferable to NI Water as required by law. The new infrastructure will be hidden from the site using natural shrubbery and the manhole in the path will be on level ground. The works, when completed, should not impact on the use of the park.

The Compliance Manager, Lands Officer and Parks and Cemeteries Officer met with the consultant and representatives from Crawfordsburn Construction Limited on site.
It is estimated that work on the site will take 2 weeks and the company proposes to maintain pedestrian access to the park via Main Street permanently during the works (of limited width) but restricted access may be necessary at times to allow works to be undertaken.

Council officers have been consulted and no issues have been raised.

WSC consulting have provided two head wall options for the works within Council land to allow connection to the watercourse (see attached at Appendices 2 and 3).

Any agreement should be subject to the following:

- A suitable agreement being drawn up;
- Crawfordsburn Construction Limited to indemnify the Council against all claims which may arise from the use of Council’s land;
- Crawfordsburn Construction Limited to reinstate the area to the satisfaction of the Council’s officers;
- If applicable, Crawfordsburn Construction Limited to pay the Council’s legal fees in relation to this matter;
- Crawfordsburn Construction Limited agreeing to pay a suitable fee for the use of the land, such fee to be determined by Land and Property Services;
- The use of the site to be managed in such a way as to cause minimum disruption to the surrounding area;
- Crawfordsburn Construction Limited to provide Council with reasonable notice of commencement of the work on Council land;
- Council officers to agree the final headwall option;

**RECOMMENDATION**

It is recommended that the Council accedes to the request and permits the works subject to the terms and conditions listed above.
Section A-A

Front Elevation

150mm thick stone pitching set in and bedded on 150mm thick grade C25 concrete

Engraving Watercourse
Bank / Bed

Notes:
1. This drawing is to be read in conjunction with other civil engineering drawings including the specific project specification(s) on drawings as well as the architectural drawings.
2. The contractor is responsible for verifying all dimensions on site and ensuring that all dimensions and levels shown on this drawing comply with other relevant drawings.
3. Any discrepancies should be reported to the next consulting as soon as possible after they are determined.

Stone pitching to be smooth, hard and durable.
**ITEM 16**

**Ards and North Down Borough Council**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Report Classification</th>
<th>Unclassified</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Council/Committee</td>
<td>Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Meeting</td>
<td>24 April 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Director</td>
<td>Director of Organisational Development and Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Head of Service</td>
<td>Head of Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Report</td>
<td>10 April 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>File Reference</td>
<td>LP428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 75 Compliant</td>
<td>Yes ☒ No ☐ Not Applicable ☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>Request from NIE for a wayleave at Abbey Road playing field Millisle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attachments</td>
<td>Site Map</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Council has received a request from NIE for a wayleave over Council land, as shown on the attached map. The proposal involves the laying of approximately 115 metres of high voltage underground cable which will facilitate the removal of all high voltage equipment located within the playing fields and their vicinity. This is to comply with new Electricity Safety Quality and Continuity Regulations (ESQCR) which require NIE to remove overhead cables and poles from schools, play areas and parks. Council officers have been consulted and have met with a representative from NIE on site and no issues have been raised.

**RECOMMENDATION**

It is recommended that, subject to the payment of suitable rental, the Council accedes to the request and permits the works on the conditions that NIE:

- Indemnifies the Council against all claims which may result from the works.
- Reinstates the areas to the satisfaction of the Council’s officers.
As part of the Northern Ireland Rural Development Programme there is a potential for the development of a co-operation project between Grey Point Fort (Bangor) and Fort Dunree. Fort Dunree is a coastal defence fortification located on the west coast of the Inishowen Peninsula.

A Letter of Offer is currently in place for the pre-development phase of a co-operation project between both forts, which is due to be completed by the end of April 2019. This has been an important stage in order to identify suitable capital works and to develop a cross working relationship with many partners. The overall aim of this pre-development stage was to identify shared themes and stories and to document these to enable potential future projects at both Grey Point Fort and Fort Dunree.

The next phase involves the implementation of a joint project with clearly defined deliverables producing benefits for all of the participating partners. There is an opportunity to avail of capital funding of up to £220,000 of grant aid at 75% grant aid which can be used to deliver a scheme at Grey Point Fort. The project will be
managed under the co-ordinating LAG role of Ards and North Down Rural Partnership, however, the application must be made by the Council as the programme’s lead financial administrator, in partnership with other statutory agencies.

Recently, Officers from Historic Environment Division (HED), DAERA and the Council met to discuss progressing the project. The meeting was positive regarding potential partnership working and exploring ways to maximise the funding opportunity available under the Rural Development Programme.

HED has indicated that it plans to invest further in local Heritage sites, one of which is Grey Point Fort. HED is undertaking a development plan for the entire site, with Phase I being the project put forward under the Rural Development Project Co-Operation Programme. This being:

(i) Development of interpretation and restoration search lights and trenches to provide a unique visitor experience which will increase dwell time and attract more visitors to the area.

(ii) Development of improved visitor facilities subject to budgets.

The realisation of Phase I requires delivery of a business plan, interpretation expertise and a technical design study. In addition, a number of funding pre-requisites are required to be place before an application can be made to the Programme. HED will be responsible for furnishing the Council with the planning permission / building consent required, full procurement of any capital works and the completion of an independent Economic Appraisal, to allow an application to be submitted to the Fund by the deadline of September 2019.

The relationship of partners going forward will be defined and agreed through a Co-Operation Agreement, a template of which will be provided by DAERA. There is no financial contribution required from the Council towards the project. However, HED has asked if the Council could source a consultant via the SCAPE Framework to undertake the independent Economic Appraisal, which it will fund. It is assumed at this stage that the project would be striving to attain the maximum grant at total project value of circa £220,000 (75% grant aid). The remaining 25% match fund will be provided using a combination of a cash contribution from HED and Contribution in Kind, which is anticipated would be the technical labour resource supplied directly by HED staff.

RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Council approves:

1) the submission of an application to the co-operation Scheme for the Phase I development of Grey Point Fort as a unique visitor attraction, subject to a Co-operation Agreement being in place between HED and ANDBC, which fulfils the requirements of the Scheme and
2) the assistance to source a consultant via the SCAPE Framework to undertake the independent Economic Appraisal, which HED will fund.
At the November Council meeting a resolution on the commitment to funding of LEADER programmes following the United Kingdom’s withdrawal from the European Union was discussed.

It was resolved that correspondence would be sent to the Prime Minister’s Office, President of the European Council, President of the European Committee of the Regions, President of the European Parliament and President of the European Commission to emphasise the importance of maintaining rural development and fisheries funding in the future.

The Council has received two responses.

The response received from the President of the European Commission, attached at Appendix one, outlines that the endorsement of the Withdrawal Agreement agreed of
25 November 2018 remains the best solution for ensuring the continuation of all EU programmes in the United Kingdom, including LEADER and the European Maritime and Fisheries Fund. If this Withdrawal Agreement is not ratified, there is a legislative measure to allow the European Union to continue to fund these programmes in the United Kingdom in 2019, subject to conditions. The arrangements for the next programme will be subject to the conditions for participation of third countries set out in the corresponding programmes’ legal bases which are currently being discussed.

The response received from the President of the European Committee of the Regions, attached at Appendix two, outlines that they have set up an interregional group on Brexit to enable the exchange of views and learn about the consequences of Brexit after the United Kingdom leaves the EU. The aim is to share ideas on solutions to be put in place to support the local and regional authorities most affected and to adopt the respective regional economies.

**RECOMMENDATION**

It is recommended that the Council notes the report.
Dear Mr Reid,

President Juncker would like to thank you for your letter of 18 January 2019 on the importance of funding of LEADER programmes following the United Kingdom's withdrawal from the European Union. The President asked me to reply on his behalf.

The endorsement of the Withdrawal Agreement agreed on 25 November 2018 remains the best solution for ensuring the continuation of all EU programmes in the United Kingdom, including LEADER and the European Maritime and Fisheries Fund (EMFF) in Northern Ireland, and this continues to be our priority.

During the negotiations on the United Kingdom's withdrawal, specific attention has been given to the cross-border programmes PEACE and INTERREG between Ireland and Northern Ireland that are managed by the Special EU Programmes Body (SEUPB). They have been identified by both sides in the negotiations as important drivers of regional development in the cross-border context and as important contributors to the continued process of peace building and reconciliation. For that reason, on 19 December 2018, the Commission proposed that those programmes should continue to be funded even if the Withdrawal Agreement is not ratified.

Mr Stephen K. REID
Chief Executive
Ards and North Down Borough Council

E-mail: enquiries@ardsandnorthdown.gov.uk
For all other financial programmes, including LEADER and EMFF programmes in Northern Ireland, the Commission proposed a legislative measure on 30 January 2019. If the Withdrawal Agreement is not ratified, this measure would allow the European Union to continue to fund these programmes in the United Kingdom in 2019, on the condition that the United Kingdom fulfils its financial obligations towards the European Union for that year and ensures that EU rules regarding audit and controls can continue to be enforced for these programmes.

The United Kingdom's participation in European Union programmes of the next programming period (2021 to 2027) will be subject to the conditions for participation of third countries set out in the corresponding programmes' legal bases. These are currently being discussed by the European Parliament and the Council.

Accordingly, for LEADER, the legal base and conditions for any potential participation of non-EU partners in co-operation projects will be determined by the conditions set in the post-2020 Common Agricultural Policy (CAP).

Regarding PEACE, the situation is again specific. Given the importance of these activities, the Commission has proposed a new PEACE PLUS programme combining the two existing cross-border programmes. It is designed to continue fostering peace and reconciliation actions as well as cooperation between the communities in Northern Ireland and in the border regions of Ireland in various contexts. The United Kingdom would contribute to the programme under specific rules.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]
Clara Martínez Alberola
Mr Stephen Reid  
Chief Executive of Ards and North Down Borough Council  
Town Hall, The Castle  
Bangor, BT20 4BT (UK)

Dear Mr Reid,

I would like to thank you for your letter of the 18th January of 2019 expressing your concerns about the funding of the future LEADER programmes following the UK’s withdrawal from the European Union (EU).

As the EU’s assembly of local and regional governments, protecting the interests of local rural areas and increasing their capacity to tackle local development objectives is our priority. We acknowledge that the funding provided by the Rural Development Programmes is critically important to improve economic prosperity and the quality of life in all European regions.

For your information, the European Committee of the Regions have set-up an interregional group on Brexit to enable the exchange of views and learn about the consequences of Brexit after the United Kingdom leaves the EU. The aim is to share ideas on solutions to be put in place to support the local and regional authorities most affected and to adapt the respective regional economies.

Yours sincerely,

Karl-Heinz LAMBERTZ
ITEM 18

Ards and North Down Borough Council

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Report Classification</th>
<th>Unclassified</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Council/Committee</td>
<td>Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Meeting</td>
<td>24 April 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Director</td>
<td>Director of Regeneration, Development and Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Head of Service</td>
<td>Head of Tourism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Report</td>
<td>12 April 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>File Reference</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 75 Compliant</td>
<td>Yes ☒ No ☐ Other ☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If other, please add comment below:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>Change of date Bangor and Newtownards Christmas Switch On</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attachments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Background

A programme for Tourism Events for 2019 was presented to Council in December 2018. Dates of 16 November for Bangor and 22 November 2019 had been recommended for Switch On events, based on previous years. Officers have been working with both Chambers in the detailed planning for both events which has resulted in Bangor and Newtownards Chambers requesting a change of dates.

Bangor Chamber have requested the date changes because:

- It is felt it’s just too early to ‘officially’ start the Christmas season!
- The 16th November is very close to Remembrance Sunday
- 16th is also too close after Halloween half-term with children only back at school one week beforehand.
- 23rd November would give the retailers more time to get windows dressed for the season and it is then only ‘one month to go’ before Christmas which would give us a different (& refreshing) marketing angle.
Newtownards Chamber are planning to change the date and day of the event in Newtownards. Previously the event has been held on a Friday evening, however the Chamber would propose to hold a large market along High Street with participants from both local premises and the traditional Saturday market. Thus they have requested that the event be held on Saturday 30 November 2019.

Operationally this does not present any difficulty in the current programme, and officers support both requests for change of date.

**RECOMMENDATION**

It is recommended that Council approve the following new dates for Christmas Switch On events in 2019:
- Bangor 23 November
- Newtownards 30 November
A small development comprising of 7 dwellings is currently under construction on lands at High Bangor Road, Donaghadee. The developer suggests the name Montgomery Meadows. Sir Hugh Montgomery was born in Scotland in 1560 then settled in Newtownards. He built a large stone quay at Donaghadee to accommodate vessels ferrying between Scotland and Ireland from 1616 onwards establishing a trade route between Donaghadee and Portpatrick.

**RECOMMENDATION**

It is recommended that Montgomery Meadows be adopted.

That Council accept the general name and delegate acceptance of suffixes to the Building Control department.
Ards and North Down Borough Council

Table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Report Classification</td>
<td>Unclassified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council/Committee</td>
<td>Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Meeting</td>
<td>24 April 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Director</td>
<td>Director of Environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Head of Service</td>
<td>Building Control, Licensing and Neighbourhood Environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Report</td>
<td>11 April 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>File Reference</td>
<td>EL 2084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislation</td>
<td>The Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) (NI) Order 1985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 75 Compliant</td>
<td>Yes ☒ No ☐ Other ☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>Grant of Entertainment Licences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attachments</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FOSSETT’S CIRCUS**

**Applicant:** Ards & North Down Borough Council

**Day and hours of use:** Monday – Sunday 4 PM to 10 PM

**Type of Entertainment:** Circus

No objections have been received to any of these applications.

**RECOMMENDATION**

That the licences are granted
Ards and North Down Borough Council

Report Classification | Unclassified
--- | ---
Council/Committee | Council
Date of Meeting | 24 April 2019
Responsible Director | Director of Organisational Development and Administration
Responsible Head of Service | Head of Administration
Date of Report | 11 April 2019
File Reference | LP447
Legislation | Section 96 Local Government Act (Northern Ireland) 1972
Section 75 Compliant | Yes ☒ No ☐ Not Applicable ☐
Subject | Request by Portavogie Coastal Rowing Club to install cargo container at Anchor Park and carry out works to instal gate at old slip way
Attachments | Appendix 1 - Map
 | Appendix 2 - Work specification

Request

The Portavogie Coastal Rowing Club have made the following request to Council:

1. To install a 40-foot cargo container at the toilet end of Anchor carpark in Portavogie. This is for the purposes of storing their rowing boat along with equipment and small sink.

2. To remove a section of fencing from the coast path at the old slip way and replace with a gate to enable a safe launching off point for their boat.

The annexed map marks out the areas for the proposed container and gate.

Site meeting and internal consultation

The Compliance Manager met with three club members and Councillor Adair to discuss the proposal and review the site areas for the proposal. The members were
advise at the time that the Council does not own beyond the fence at the coastal path, so had no standing with regards to comment on the slip way.

The proposal and preliminary works specification (annexed to the report) has been sent to Council officers as part of the internal consultation process. The only two points raised were:

1. The Club would require planning permission for the container, and

2. The proposed plans should not interfere with the Peace IV project that is set to commence in Autumn 2019 at the other side of the car park.

It is proposed that Council accedes to this request subject to the following conditions:

1. The final specification being approved by Council officers,
2. A formal lease agreement for no longer than 2 years for the storage container,
3. A formal licence agreement for works to the proposed gate,
4. The gate being gifted to the Council subject to final inspection and approval by officers,
5. All statutory requirements being met by the club,
6. Land and Property Services providing a valuation for the lease, and
7. Proof of indemnity/third party/public liability insurance for the works to the proposed gate.
8. That the plans do not interfere with the above Peace IV project.

RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that Council accedes to this request subject to the conditions as outlined above.
Dear Michael Young

In response to your email:

1) **Exact chosen location for storage container at Anchor car park.** We are currently waiting for our architect’s scale drawing which should arrive early next week. However in lieu of this we have attached an outline picture of where we would like to position the container in the Anchor carpark in Portavogie. This is not to scale.

2) **Specification of size, colour and fabrication of the storage container** The specifications for the 40’ container:

**Main Frame, Side sheets & Roof Sheets:**
3-4mm folded steel channel base and joists, folded upright posts and top frame all fully welded, 2mm profile steel in-fill sheets fully welded on all horizontal and vertical seams and to main structure with air vents under top frame section,

**Lifting Points:** 4nr welded lifting eyes,

**Paint:** Primed with Sherwin Williams M155 High Solids Quick drying alkyd anticorrosive protective/finish pigmented with zinc phosphate, Top coated with one Dark Green coat Zinfos 750 High solids anti corrosive glossy finish

**Flooring:** 18mm structural grade plywood flooring secured to steel joists and covered with industrial cushion flooring

**Insulation & Lining:** Internal walls have 35mm thick high-density, fire retardant insulation

**Doors & Locks:** fitted with Secure 10 point locking system double steel doors fitted with insurance approved 7-pin action multi-lock supplied with 2 licensed keys, and top and bottom locking bars on each door operated by concealed arc handle behind secondary hinged steel cover that overlaps onto opposite door with shrouded padlock area,

**Shutters & Windows:** Standard windows are single glazed, aluminium framed with hinged steel shutters secured internally with top and bottom spring bolts.

3) **Specification of proposed gate at slipway at the coast.** Gate Specification – galvanized metal double gate with galvanized metal posts in keeping with recycled plastic fence. We are currently waiting for the design and fabrication engineers exact specifications. We are also considering constructing the gate using recycled plastic in keeping with the current fence. In the interim we have attached a rough sketch showing size of gate required.

We will forward all information from architect and fabrication engineers as soon as possible.

Kindest regards,

Heather.
Heather Hoffman
Vice Chair
Portavogie Coastal Rowing Club
Please find attached a Status Report in respect of Notices of Motion.

This is a standing item on the Council agenda each month and its aim is to keep members updated on the outcome of motions. Please note that as each motion is dealt with it will be removed from the report.

RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Council notes the report.
## NOTICE OF MOTIONS UPDATE – APRIL 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE RECEIVED</th>
<th>NOTICE</th>
<th>SUBMITTED BY</th>
<th>COUNCIL MEETING DATE</th>
<th>COMMITTEE REFERRED TO</th>
<th>OUTCOME OF COMMITTEE WHERE NOM DEBATED</th>
<th>MONTH IT WILL BE REPORTED BACK TO COMMITTEE</th>
<th>OTHER ACTION TO BE TAKEN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31/05/15</td>
<td>Permanent recognition of Rory McIlroy in Holywood</td>
<td>Councillor Muir</td>
<td>24/06/15</td>
<td>Corporate Services 13.10.15</td>
<td>Agreed</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28/2/17</td>
<td>War Memorial – Conlig</td>
<td>Councillors Barry and Woods</td>
<td>Council March 2017</td>
<td>Corporate Services Committee April 2017</td>
<td>Agreed in principle pending report</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/1/18</td>
<td>Consultation with Millisle and Ballycopeland Presbyterian Church about memorial to missionary Amy Carmichael</td>
<td>Councillor Thompson</td>
<td>Council – January 2018</td>
<td>Environment Committee – February 2018</td>
<td>Agreed to bring back report to C&amp;W</td>
<td>January 2019</td>
<td>To be ratified March 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/3/18</td>
<td>Online community directory</td>
<td>Councillor Douglas</td>
<td>Council – March 2018</td>
<td>Community &amp; Wellbeing – April 2018 - deferred</td>
<td>Agreed to bring back report</td>
<td>June 2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DATE RECEIVED</td>
<td>NOTICE</td>
<td>SUBMITTED BY</td>
<td>COUNCIL MEETING DATE</td>
<td>COMMITTEE REFERRED TO</td>
<td>OUTCOME OF COMMITTEE WHERE NOM DEBATED</td>
<td>MONTH IT WILL BE REPORTED BACK TO COMMITTEE</td>
<td>OTHER ACTION TO BE TAKEN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21/3/18</td>
<td>Accessible green space – Town Park in Newtownards</td>
<td>Councillor Smart &amp; Councillor Kennedy</td>
<td>Council – April 2018</td>
<td>Community &amp; Wellbeing – May 2018</td>
<td></td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Reporting to Corporate March 2019 regarding Ards FC first</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19/7/18</td>
<td>Appropriate signage at Movilla Cemetery</td>
<td>Councillor McIlveen</td>
<td>Council – August 2018</td>
<td>Community &amp; Wellbeing - Sept 18</td>
<td>Deferred to C&amp;WC October 2018</td>
<td>Referral to Corporate Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21/8/18</td>
<td>Memorial to 8 people killed at 1936 TT Race</td>
<td>Councillor Kennedy</td>
<td>Council – August 2018</td>
<td>Corporate - Oct 18 Deferred to November 2018</td>
<td>Agreed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/12/18</td>
<td>Council estate not to be used in any way to compromise welfare of animals</td>
<td>Councillor Robinson</td>
<td>Council – December 2018</td>
<td>Corporate Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>June 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/12/18</td>
<td>SPORTS INITIATIVE (suicide prevention offering recovery through sport)</td>
<td>Alderman Irvine</td>
<td>Council – December 2018</td>
<td>Community and Wellbeing Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>June 2109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/1/19</td>
<td>Disabled access to Cloughhey beach</td>
<td>Councillors Adair, Edmund and Thompson</td>
<td>Council – January 2019</td>
<td>Environment Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>June 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DATE RECEIVED</td>
<td>NOTICE</td>
<td>SUBMITTED BY</td>
<td>COUNCIL MEETING DATE</td>
<td>COMMITTEE REFERRED TO</td>
<td>OUTCOME OF COMMITTEE WHERE NOM DEBATED</td>
<td>MONTH IT WILL BE REPORTED BACK TO COMMITTEE</td>
<td>OTHER ACTION TO BE TAKEN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/1/19</td>
<td>Usefulness of mobile phone apps</td>
<td>Councillor Martin and Councillor McIlveen</td>
<td>Council – January 2019</td>
<td>Environment Committee</td>
<td>June 2019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21/1/19</td>
<td>Shelter at slipway in Donaghadee</td>
<td>Councillor Brooks and Councillor Smith</td>
<td>Council – January 2019</td>
<td>Environment Committee</td>
<td>June 2019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22/1/19</td>
<td>Climate breakdown</td>
<td>Councillor Woods and Councillor McKee</td>
<td>Council – January 2019</td>
<td>Environment Committee</td>
<td>September 2019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14/2/19</td>
<td>Plaque in Memory of Mr John Johnston</td>
<td>Alderman Girvan</td>
<td>Council – February 2019</td>
<td>Community and Wellbeing Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/2/19</td>
<td>Footway in Ballyhalbert</td>
<td>Councillors Boyle, Thompson, Adair, Edmund, Aldermen Carson and Councillor McAlpine</td>
<td>Council – March 2019</td>
<td>Environment Committee – June 19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The following Notice of Motion was agreed by Corporate Services Committee in March 2019:

“There is an ever-growing problem of cars being parked around the residential areas of Bangor West, Carnalea and Helen's Bay railway stations. This cannot be ignored by Translink or the Department for Infrastructure. I propose that this Council writes to Translink and the Department for Infrastructure inviting a senior member of staff from each to attend Council to listen to Councillor's concerns and at least try to provide some answers.”

The attached response has been received from Chris Conway, Group Chief Executive for Translink detailing the current position.

RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that Council notes this report.
Your Ref: SR/sa/NOM98/CS.12.3.19/30.4

12 April 2019

Mr Stephen Reid
Chief Executive
Ards and North Down Borough Council
Town Hall
The Castle
BANGOR
BT20 4BT

Dear Stephen,

Thank you for your letter in relation to car parking issues in the residential areas of Bangor West, Carnalea and Helen’s Bay railway stations.

Translink is aware of the ongoing issues for commuter parking in these areas and is sympathetic to residents. Indeed, we have raised the issues with Department for Infrastructure (DfI) in the past.

Unfortunately, we do not have parking facilities at these stations and there is no realistic scope to offer relief through the provision of park and ride facilities in such dense residential areas. This is an issue commonly experienced on suburban rail networks across the UK and Ireland.

Whilst matters such as parking enforcement, restrictions and permits in this area are outside of Translink’s control, we do provide 347 spaces for passengers travelling from the main Bangor Bus and Rail station and actively encourage passengers to use sustainable transport such as car sharing, walking and cycling to stations, where possible.

Finally, Translink would be happy to attend a meeting with Councillors and can confirm a senior representative once a date has been arranged (as this will allow us to assess availability).

Hopefully this will be of assistance.

Yours sincerely,

Chris Conway
Group Chief Executive

www.translink.co.uk
Ards and North Down Borough Council

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Report Classification</th>
<th>Unclassified</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Council/Committee</td>
<td>Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Meeting</td>
<td>24 April 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Director</td>
<td>Director of Community and Wellbeing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Head of Service</td>
<td>Head of Community &amp; Culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Report</td>
<td>16 April 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>File Reference</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 75 Compliant</td>
<td>Yes ☑ No ☐ Other ☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If other, please add comment below:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>Response to Notice of Motion re Water Charges on Community Houses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attachments</td>
<td>Letter from Northern Ireland Water</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following Notice of Motion was agreed by the Community and Wellbeing Committee in February 2019:

“That this Council expresses its concern with the decision by NI Water to pursue community houses with water charges. Community organisations struggle for funding on an annual basis, and would not be able to get funding for services such as water charges, especially backdated charges. These charges therefore put community organisations in financial hardship and put their ability to serve their community at risk. This Council therefore writes to NI Water and the Permanent Secretary at the Department for Infrastructure asking that the water charges are waived for community houses in our Borough, particularly the backdated charges.”

The attached response has been received from Sara Venning, Chief Executive for Northern Ireland Water detailing the current position.

**RECOMMENDATION**

It is recommended that Council notes this report.
Dear Mr. Reid,

Contact Reference: 9010419/36188

Re: Water Charges on Community Houses

Thank you for your letter, which I received on 29 March 2019, regarding the application of charges to Community Houses.

NI Water is committed to the application of charges in a fair and equitable manner. All properties that use water for non-domestic purposes, including properties used primarily for charitable, non-profit or religious purposes, are equally liable for water and sewerage charges, if applicable.

Whilst I fully appreciate the financial constraints that can affect Community Houses, and the organisations that use them, NI Water also faces similar constraints. In order for NI Water to continue operating and to provide all of our customers with essential services, we must ensure charges are levied for all non-domestic supplies. As such, we would be unable to consider your request to waive charges for properties of this nature.

In your correspondence you also requested the reversal of back-dated charges for Community Houses. While we would be unable to facilitate this request, due to the reasons outlined above, NI Water previously recognised the financial impact of back-dated charges and in April 2017 the period for applying retrospective charges was reduced from 6 years to 18 months.
It would not be our aim to push any of our customers into financial hardship, and I would wish to stress that any customers who are experiencing difficulties with their water bills, should get in contact with our Collections department, on 03457 440088, who will be able to offer suitable payment plans, according to individual customer need.

I hope you find this information helpful.

Yours Sincerely,

Sara

Sara Venning
Chief Executive
### ITEM 26.1.

**Ards and North Down Borough Council**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Report Classification</th>
<th>Unclassified</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Council/Committee</td>
<td>Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Meeting</td>
<td>24 April 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Director</td>
<td>Director of Organisational Development and Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Head of Service</td>
<td>Head of Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Report</td>
<td>16 April 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>File Reference</td>
<td>NOM 94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 75 Compliant</td>
<td>Yes ☒ No ☐ Other ☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If other, please add comment below:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>Response to Notice of Motion re Problem Gambling and Fixed Odds Betting Terminals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attachments</td>
<td>App 1 - Letter from Dept for Communities App 2 - Letter from Department of Health</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following Notice of Motion was agreed by Corporate Services Committee in February 2019:

“Council notes the enormous damage gambling addiction can cause in the lives of individuals, families and communities. In May 2017 the Department for Communities published a survey, which found a problem gambling prevalence rate of 2.3% in Northern Ireland, a rate over four times higher than in England. Furthermore, this Council notes the move by Her Majesty’s Government to reduce stakes on Fixed Odds Betting Terminals (FOBTs), a particularly addictive form of gambling, from £100 to £2 in April 2019. The Council further notes that this decision does not apply to Northern Ireland and in the absence of an Executive and Assembly action cannot be taken to reduce the stakes on these terminals. The Council calls on betting companies operating in Northern Ireland to follow the decision of Ladbrokes to voluntarily reduce the stakes on FOBT machines in this jurisdiction in line with the rest of the UK. The Council also calls on the Department of Health to review support given to individuals suffering from gambling addiction and calls for the creation of a dedicated service to address this addiction. The Council writes to the Departments
of Health and Communities to encourage them to do all in their power to support those with gambling addiction and to ascertain whether anything can be currently done regarding FOBTs in Northern Ireland.”

The attached responses have been received from Richard Pengelly, Permanent Secretary and HSC Chief Executive and Tracy Meharg, Permanent Secretary for Department for Communities.

RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that Council notes this report.
Mr Stephen Reid
Chief Executive
Ards and North Down Borough Council
Town Hall
The Castle
Bangor
BT20 4BT

Via email: ardsandnorthdown.gov.uk

Dear Stephen

PROBLEM GAMBLING AND FIXED ODDS BETTING TERMINALS

Thank you for your letter of 19 March in which you pass on the Notice of Motion adopted by Ards and North Down Borough Council at a recent meeting in respect of problem gambling and Fixed Odds Betting Terminals (FOBTs).

As you may be aware, this Department is responsible for gambling policy and legislation while issues around problem gambling fall within the remit of the Department of Health; I am, therefore, responding on behalf of both Departments.

I can advise that the majority of the businesses operating Fixed Odds Betting Terminals here, representing approximately 75% of bookmaking offices in Northern Ireland, have announced their intention to voluntarily limit the maximum stakes of FOBTs to reflect the change in legislation which will come into force in Great Britain on 1 April 2019. This Department has recently written to all bookmakers acknowledging this commitment and encouraging those operators not yet committed to implementing this voluntary limit to adopt the same approach. Officials are monitoring the position and will determine what, if any, additional action is required.

With regard to the issue of problem gambling, the Department of Health recognises that this is an issue that is of increasing concern to society. Problem gambling can negatively affect an individual's financial situation and it can also have a serious effect on mental health and wellbeing. The Royal College of Psychiatrists have noted that problem gamblers are more likely to suffer from low self-esteem, develop stress-
related disorders, become anxious, develop a substance misuse problem, or suffer from depression.

There are no gambling specific services commissioned by the Health and Social Care Board in Northern Ireland. However, where problem gambling causes mental health issues, such as, anxiety or depression appropriate help and support for that condition would be provided, in line with the clinical need and current service provision for mental health. This includes, for example counselling, psychological therapies and the Lifeline 24/7 crisis response service.

Further to this, gambling support is also available in the community and voluntary sector, such as, Gamblers Anonymous, Addiction NI, GamCare and Dunlewey Addiction Service. This is particularly relevant where the gambling does not cause mental ill health, or where there is no recognised clinical need for treatment.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]

TRACY MEHARG
PERMANENT SECRETARY
From the Permanent Secretary
and HSC Chief Executive

Mr Stephen Reid
Ards and North Down Council
Town Hall
The Castle
Bangor
BT20 4BT

Castle Buildings
Upper Newtownards Road
BELFAST, BT4 3SQ
Tel: 02890520559
Email: richard.pengelly@health-ni.gov.uk

Our ref: RP3794
SCORR-0308-2019

Date: 29 March 2019

Dear Mr Reid

Thank you for your letter in relation to gambling, fixed odds betting terminals and a call on the Department of Health to review the support given to individuals suffering from gambling addictions and to create a dedicated service to address this addiction.

The policy responsibility for gambling and fixed odds betting terminals rests primarily with the Department of Communities. However, the Department of Health recognises that problem gambling is an issue that is of increasing concern to society. Problem gambling can negatively affect an individual's financial situation and it can also have a serious effect on mental health and wellbeing. The Royal College of Psychiatrists have noted that problem gamblers are more likely to suffer from low self-esteem, develop stress-related disorders, become anxious, develop a substance misuse problem, or suffer from depression.

There are no gambling specific services commissioned by the Health and Social Care Board in Northern Ireland. However, where problem gambling causes mental health issues, such as, anxiety or depression appropriate help and support for that condition would be provided, in line with the clinical need and current service provision for mental health. This includes, for example counselling, psychological therapies and the Lifeline 24/7 crisis response service.

Further to this, gambling support is also available in the community and voluntary sector, such as, Gamblers Anonymous, Addiction NI, GamCare and Dunlewey Addiction Service. This is particularly relevant where the gambling does not cause mental ill health, or where there is no recognised clinical need for treatment.

Yours sincerely

RICHARD PENGELLY