

August 20th, 2026

Notice Of Meeting

You are requested to attend the meeting to be held on **Wednesday, 26th August 2026 at 7:00 pm** in **Hybrid - City Hall, Bangor and via Zoom**.

ARDS AND NORTH DOWN BOROUGH COUNCIL

18 August 2026

Dear Sir/Madam

You are hereby invited to attend a hybrid Meeting (in person and via Zoom) of Ards and North Down Borough Council which will be held at the City Hall, The Castle, Bangor on **Wednesday, 26 August 2026 at 7.00pm.**

Yours faithfully

Susie McCullough
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 of August 2026 (Copy attached)
6. Minutes of Council meeting dated 29 July 2026 (Copy attached)
7. Minutes of Planning Committee dated 4 August 2026 (Copy attached)
8. Deputation Requests
 - 8.1 NCLT (Report attached)
 - 8.2 Bangor BID (Report attached)
 - 8.3 Regional Asset Management Strategy Limited (Report attached)
9. Consultation on Tobacco and Vapes: Packaging, Appearance and Display (Report attached)
10. Sealing Documents
11. Transfer of Rights of Burial

12. Notice of Motion Status Report (Report attached)

13. Notices of Motion

13.1 Notice of Motion submitted by Councillor Douglas and Alderman Cummings

That officers are tasked with engaging with boxing clubs and groups in Comber to explore how the Council can assist those clubs and groups and encourage growth of the sport in the town and further that officers look at a feasibility study into the development of the sport.

13.2 Notice of Motion submitted by Councillor Wray and Councillor Newman

On the night of 15th-16th April 1941, as the Luftwaffe attacked the city of Belfast, fourteen bombs also fell in the town of Bangor, killing 5 local residents.

During the course of the raid, 35 Bangor residents sustained injuries. Carnegie Library was set up as a temporary morgue for the fatalities.

As part of the current Cathedral Gardens redevelopment, there will be a fitting memorial to those who lost their lives in the Belfast Blitz. The casualties in Bangor will not be named.

On the basis, that there appears to be no knowledge of any memorial to the people who lost their lives here in Bangor, Officers are tasked with a report on the potential for a memorial or suitable plaque within Ward Park, Bangor (with the inclusion of the Carnegie Library), marking the local loss of life.

13.3. Notice of Motion submitted by Councillor Boyle and Alderman McAlpine

That officers bring back an options paper as to how Council could assist the Portaferry Gala Fest Committee & Community, to recognise the forthcoming very special occasion with the Borough involving the 60th anniversary of Gala Week taking place in July 2027.

IN CONFIDENCE

14. New Cemetery – Land at Ballymacormick Road, Bangor. (Report and Appendices attached)

15. Enforcement issues at Conway Square (Report and Appendices attached)

MEMBERSHIP OF ARDS AND NORTH DOWN BOROUGH COUNCIL

Alderman Adair	Councillor Harbinson
Alderman Armstrong-Cotter	Councillor Hennessy
Alderman Brooks	Councillor Hollywood
Alderman Cummings	Councillor S Irvine
Alderman Graham	Councillor W Irvine
Alderman McAlpine	Councillor Kennedy
Alderman McRandal	Councillor Kendall
Alderman McDowell	Councillor Kerr
Alderman McIlveen	Councillor McBurney
Alderman Smith	Councillor McClean
Councillor Ashe	Councillor McCollum
Councillor Blaney (Mayor)	Councillor McCracken
Councillor Boyle	Councillor McKee
Councillor Brady	Councillor Moore
Councillor Cathcart	Councillor Morgan
Councillor Chambers	Councillor Newman
Councillor Cochrane (Deputy Mayor)	Councillor Quinn
Councillor Douglas	Councillor Smart
Councillor Edmund	Councillor Thompson
Councillor Gilmour	Councillor Wray

ITEM 6

4

ARDS AND NORTH DOWN BOROUGH COUNCIL

A hybrid meeting (in person and via Zoom) of Ards and North Down Borough Council was held at the City Hall, The Castle, Bangor on Wednesday 29 July 2026 commencing at 7.00pm.

In the Chair:

The Mayor (Councillor Blaney)

Aldermen:

Adair	McDowell
Armstrong-Cotter	McIlveen
Cummings	McRandal
Graham	Smith
McAlpine (Zoom)	

Councillors:

Boyle	Kendall (Zoom
Brady	7.07pm)
Cathcart	Kerr (Zoom)
Chambers (Zoom)	McBurney (Zoom)
Cochrane	McClellan
Douglas	McCollum
Edmund	McCracken
Harbinson	McKee (Zoom)
Hennessy (Zoom)	Moore
Hollywood	Quinn
Irvine, S	Smart
Irvine, W	Thompson
	Wray

Officers: Chief Executive (S McCullough), Director of Active and Healthy Communities (A Faulkner), Director of Corporate Services (M Steele), Director of Environmental Services (G Bannister), Head of Communications and Marketing (C Jackson), Democratic Services Manager (J Wilson) and Democratic Services Officer (R King)

1. PRAYER

The Mayor welcomed everyone to the meeting and invited the Chief Executive to read the Council prayer.

NOTED.

2. APOLOGIES

The Mayor sought apologies at this stage.

Apologies had been received from Alderman Brooks, Councillor Ashe, Councillor Morgan, Councillor Newman and Councillor Gilmour.

Apologies for lateness were received from Councillor Kendall.

NOTED.

3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

The Mayor sought Declarations of Interest and the following were declared:

Alderman Adair – Item 13 – Sealing Documents (declared at 7.19 pm)

Councillor Chambers – Item 19 - Leisure Delivery Model Update

NOTED.

4. MAYOR'S BUSINESS

The Mayor advised that earlier in the month he had travelled to the Somme region of France, accompanied by Councillor Moore and the Director of Environmental Services, to pay respects to those who had made the ultimate sacrifice for freedom. He stated that the annual visit was of great importance and that it had been an honour to represent the Council.

The Mayor expressed his thanks to all staff involved in facilitating the filming of the Antiques Roadshow at Bangor Castle, noting that the event had run smoothly and attracted a large attendance, providing an excellent opportunity to showcase both the Castle grounds and the building.

He congratulated the teams at Ards Blair Mayne Wellbeing and Leisure Centre and Comber Leisure Centre on securing Quest Excellence Accreditation in recognition of quality management and operational excellence. He welcomed the recognition received by the Council's leisure centres.

The Mayor also extended his sincere thanks to two young brothers from Millisle, Jonah and Eli, who had spent part of their school holidays cleaning street signs within the village, with a target of cleaning 50 signs in total.

The Mayor remarked that during his first few months in office he had been greatly encouraged by the strong community spirit across the Borough and particularly by the pride and care shown by young people for their local areas.

Finally, the Mayor highlighted the Bangor Vibes programme which was due to take place over the forthcoming weekend. He noted that the programme would feature a range of music and cultural events, including a pipe band competition, Bangor Beats and Rhythms, and Picnic in the Park, and expressed his anticipation of attending the celebrations.

NOTED.

5. MAYOR AND DEPUTY MAYOR ENGAGEMENTS FOR THE MONTH OF JULY 2026

(Appendix I)

PREVIOUSLY CIRCULATED:- Copy of the Mayor and Deputy Mayor Engagements for the month of July 2026.

RESOLVED, on the proposal of Alderman Armstrong-Cotter, seconded by Councillor McCollum, that the information be noted.

6. MINUTES OF COUNCIL MEETING DATED 24 JUNE 2026

PREVIOUSLY CIRCULATED:- Copy of the above minutes.

RESOLVED, on the proposal of Alderman Adair, seconded by Alderman McIlveen, that the minutes be agreed as a correct record.

(Councillor Kendall joined the meeting remotely – 7.07 pm)

7. MINUTES OF AUDIT COMMITTEE DATED 22 JUNE 2026

PREVIOUSLY CIRCULATED:- Copy of the above minutes.

RESOLVED, on the proposal of Councillor Thompson, seconded by Councillor Wray, that the minutes be approved and adopted.

8. MINUTES OF PLANNING COMMITTEE DATED 7 JULY 2026

PREVIOUSLY CIRCULATED:- Copy of the above minutes.

RESOLVED, on the proposal of Alderman Graham, seconded by Alderman Smith, that the minutes be approved and adopted.

9. CHANGES TO STANDING ORDERS

(Appendix II – III)

PREVIOUSLY CIRCULATED:- Report from the Chief Executive detailing that in line with the Policy Development Process, the Standing Orders were reviewed every three years or as required.

The full list of proposed changes was outlined in Appendix 1 within the report.

Members were asked to note that, in line with the proposed change to Standing Order 3, it was also proposed to introduce a Special Meeting Requisition Form which could be found at Appendix 2.

Updated training on Standing Orders for Members and Officers was currently being reviewed and would be rolled out in due course.

Members would be aware, when making these decisions, that under Standing Order 30, version 12, any motion to add to, vary or revoke these Standing Orders would, when proposed and seconded, stand adjourned and be referred without discussion to the next ordinary meeting of the Council and any resultant amendment would be ratified at an ordinary meeting of the Council.

Therefore, these Standing Orders were stood down at the Council meeting on 24 June 2026, for discussion at the meeting on 29 July.

RECOMMENDED that Council agrees to amend the Standing Orders as set out in the report.

Alderman McIlveen proposed, seconded by Alderman McRandal, that the recommendation be adopted.

Alderman McIlveen was content with the proposed changes, noting that this was a tidying up exercise in order to address a consistency of language issue. There were no major changes, and this was about learning lessons from issues that had occurred previously.

RESOLVED, on the proposal of Alderman McIlveen, seconded by Alderman McRandal, that the recommendation be adopted.

10. RESPONSE TO NOTICE OF MOTION ON USA 250

PREVIOUSLY CIRCULATED:- Report from the Chief Executive detailing that the purpose of the report was to present an update in response to the Notice of Motion, which requested:

“That this Council, mindful of our close connections to the United States and our role in their history, commit to mark and celebrate the United States Semiquincentennial. Officers should consider options for events of different scales, including the theming of an existing event in the calendar, as well as exploring options to collaborate on an event of an appropriate level that complements the proposals of other councils (Causeway Coast and Glens, Antrim and Newtownabbey, Lisburn and Castlereagh) and would run in the latter half of this year.”

Northern Ireland Context

Officers had engaged with neighbouring councils and joined a cross-council working group established for information sharing on proposals. As of July 2026, the emerging approach across these councils continued to prioritise complementary activity and the reframing of existing programmes where possible and appropriate, with any new initiatives being modest and subject to available budgets and resources.

Local Context

The Council was aware that local groups were planning activity to mark the anniversary, with the following events taking place during the period covered by the request:

- **Monday 29 June to Friday 24 July | Livingston Centre**

A special exhibition marking the 250th Anniversary of US Independence ran from 29 June to 24 July, which highlighted the role of the Livingston family in the American Revolution.

- **Sunday 5 July and Saturday 16 August | Donaghadee Harbour**

The Donaghadee Community Development Association had planned two dramas to mark the 250th anniversary of the signing of the United States Declaration of Independence delivered by local drama provider Valhalla Street Theatre.

- **First weekend in September | Eagle Wing Festival, Groomsport**

Delivered by Discover Groomsport (subject to confirmation of funding from the Ulster Scots Agency at the time of writing).

- **Tourism NI Experience Development Fund**

Two local experience providers, Sustainable Journeys and NI Silver, had secured funding through the Tourism NI Experience Development Fund (funded by DfC) to develop immersive experiences for North American and domestic markets. The two local providers participating in the programme would present elements of the local Ulster-Scots story.

A blog had been created on the visitardsandnorthdown.com website, setting out the Borough's links with the USA. It would be updated as further information became available: www.visitardsandnorthdown.com/blog/read/2026/03/america-250-local-links-b320.

Council Considerations

The 2026/27 summer/autumn events calendar (excluding smaller-scale arts, heritage and parks events) was expansive. Officers considered whether an existing event could be themed or expanded to reflect the United States Semiquincentennial (USA 250). Where possible, options to expand the programme were explored; however, due to cost and resource implications, it had not been possible to progress additional activity beyond the proposed approach.

Sea Bangor, given its links with the United States, would have been the only suitable event for a themed approach. However, timescales did not allow this option to be progressed.

Other events through to the end of October were either fully programmed or well advanced in development and had either well-established identities or were establishing identities focused on the Borough's key strengths, for example Shorelife Celebration.

Officers engaged with a key event partner, Open House Festival, to explore the potential for incorporating the USA 250 theme into an element of its programming. The partner confirmed that this was not feasible, as the programme had already been launched.

Officers also explored avenues with external providers, including the option of commissioning an external event organiser to deliver an event at an estimated cost of c. £15k. This would require a procurement exercise, which typically took a minimum of five weeks, in addition to the identification of a suitable location and date, subject to availability, and ongoing project management. No viable external-provider option was identified that could be delivered within the available budget, timescale and staffing capacity.

Officers had reviewed the summer/autumn event calendar and had not identified a suitable date. As noted above, early July and mid-August weekend dates aligned with the planned USA 250 Donaghadee activity (5 July and 16 August).

Based on officers' previous experience of delivering events in the latter part of July, this period tended to be less attractive for attendance due to the holiday season. It was intended that the Eagle Wing Festival, delivered by Discover Groomsport (subject to Ulster-Scots Agency funding at the time of writing), would return on the first weekend in September — the same weekend suggested for the Cackle Row Cottage activity. Officers had moved the Tide and Turf Festival a week later to avoid competing with this year's Belfast Maritime Festival and the Eats and Beats Festival, Newcastle, from both customer and supplier perspectives. October/November was also currently being targeted for the launch of Marine Gardens.

In view of the above, including existing commitments, associated project management demands, cost implications and resource pressures, delivery via outsourcing was considered unachievable. Officers had therefore concluded that, although expansion of the programme was explored where possible, there was no deliverable option to expand the programme.

Council confirmed events

The following approach was proposed, focusing on the strategic alignment, theming and promotion of relevant existing Council activity under a unified USA 250 commemorative framework. This would enable the Council to recognise the anniversary appropriately and complement planned Borough-wide activity, while maintaining delivery standards within existing operational capacity.

From September to November 2026, Ards and North Down Borough Council proposed a programme of commemorative activity to mark the United States Semiquincentennial (USA 250).

The programme reflected the Borough's historic connections with the United States and aligned with existing activity to maximise impact and value.

Groomsport would be the focal point for two of the Council's anniversary events. It was the earliest port on the North Down coast and the scene of the Eagle Wing's attempted emigration to America in September 1636.

- **Saturday 5 September | Cockle Row Cottages, Groomsport**

A themed heritage event focusing on Ulster American migration and shared history, delivered in a family-friendly and engaging format.

- **Wednesday 9 September | Commemorative Tree Planting, Donaghadee**

A civic ceremony to mark the USA 250 anniversary, featuring the planting of five commemorative trees symbolising enduring links between Ards and North Down and the United States, providing a lasting and visible legacy.

- **November 2026 | Leid AND Lairn Ulster-Scots Programme**

The Council would deliver the existing Leid AND Lairn festival as part of its USA 250 commemorations. Organised by Ards and North Down Borough Council, the festival celebrated Ulster-Scots language, culture and history. The programme would provide opportunities to explore Ulster-Scots traditions through music, storytelling and related experiences, highlighting language, folklore and cultural heritage. It would also consider the historic influence of Ulster-Scots communities locally. Events would take place across the Borough, offering accessible opportunities for residents, schools and visitors to engage with shared heritage through learning, participation and cultural celebration.

Other Opportunities

The Council had also explored links with a local author and the possibility of a literary event aimed at children, based on his current book, *The Story of Charles Thomson and the Declaration of Independence*. This remained subject to feasibility within existing resources.

Council had also had discussions with Trevor Marshall, creator of the *On Eagle's Wing* musical, about the possibility of staging an event. This was at a very early stage. Should a more definitive proposal prove possible, Officers would bring back a report to Council for consideration.

Resource Implications

Officers had explored opportunities to meet the brief where possible, including through external providers and rebranding existing events. The proposed events at this point would be incorporated into existing programmes and as such would not require additional funding. Should funding be required for the other opportunities identified above, a further report would be brought back to Council.

RECOMMENDED that the Council notes the report.

Councillor McClean proposed, seconded by Councillor Thompson, that the recommendation be adopted.

Councillor McClean thanked officers for preparing a series of events and highlighted the role of Ulster Scots people in the founding of the United States. Their contribution was understated but critical and crucial.

The Ulster Scots story was central to one of the most enduring and important relationships between the UK/Ireland and the United States. Around 200,000 Ulster Scots people came over from Ulster in the 65 years before the US rebellion.

They played a critical role in that rebellion and in shaping the country. Councillor McClean referred to historian claims that the United States Declaration of Independence movement was 'nothing more than an Ulster Scots Presbyterian movement.'

Councillor McClean believed that the Council should place itself at the heart of that story and while the history of the island of Ireland to America was often highlighted, he felt that the Ulster Scot's story was drastically undersold.

He welcomed that the connection was starting to be better understood on the other side of the Atlantic and added that Ulster had produced many American presidents.

In closing, he said that the commemoration was something everyone should be able to celebrate.

Councillor Thompson welcomed the number of celebrations taking place throughout the Borough – he had attended the launch of a Declaration of Independence project in Donaghadee which included a trail of interpretative panels throughout the town, explaining how many people from the area went to the colonies and helped shape them.

He also referred to the importance of the Eagle Wing Festival in Groomsport and he explained the importance of recognising those people from the area who crossed the Atlantic to start new lives.

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

11. CONSULTATION ON THE BATHING WATERS POLICY REVIEW FOR NORTHERN IRELAND

(Appendix III – V)

PREVIOUSLY CIRCULATED:- Report from the Chief Executive detailing that bathing water quality in Northern Ireland was regulated under the Quality of Bathing Water Regulations (Northern Ireland) 2008, as amended.

There were currently 9 designated bathing water sites within the Borough, with the Council acting as Operator at 7 beaches, these being:

- Brompton
- Ballyholme
- Groomsport
- Donaghadee
- Millisle
- Ballywalter
- Cloughey

In addition, DAERA acted as Operator at the following sites:

- Helen's Bay
- Crawfordsburn

Under these Regulations and associated DAERA arrangements, the Council, where it was the Bathing Water Operator, supported public information, liaised on monitoring and water quality, assisted with pollution or waste incidents, and helped identify potential candidate bathing sites within the Borough.

The bathing season currently ran annually from 1 June to 15 September. During this period, DAERA carried out weekly water quality monitoring at identified bathing waters and published the results on their Dashboard at: <https://www.daera-ni.gov.uk/articles/bathing-water-quality-dashboard>

The Council provided and managed signage at all identified bathing water sites, including bathing advice and a QR code linking to the latest DAERA bathing water sampling results on the Council website. Environmental Health Officers managed signage at these locations and placed 'No Bathing' signage when notified of a Poor water quality result.

Bathing water quality results were published the week after samples were taken. While this did not provide a real-time indication of water quality for swimmers on a particular day, it provided an indication of general bathing water quality. Predictive water quality data was not currently available in Northern Ireland.

DAERA had issued a consultation on the future policy and legislative framework for bathing waters in Northern Ireland. The consultation considered how bathing waters were identified, monitored and managed, including the arrangements for periodic review of bathing water sites.

Prior to publication of the consultation, DAERA held a one-day stakeholder workshop at Stormont Buildings in November 2025, which was attended by Council Officers. The workshop outcome report was attached at Appendix 2.

Key Issues

The Consultation sought views on proposals to:

1. Improve communication with bathing water users

DAERA proposed that new signage could include a Quick Response (QR) code linking users directly to online water quality information. This approach had already been implemented by the Council's Environmental Health Service across bathing water sites in the Borough, as it was compliant with current legislation.

DAERA proposed that it continued to improve its risk forecasting and modelling and it was hoped that this would be available for all designated sites and not just those with frequent poor sample results.

2. Consider the length and flexibility of the bathing season

DAERA was seeking views on whether the current bathing season, which ran from 1 June to 15 September, should be changed. The bathing season determined when bathing water monitoring and associated public health protections were put in place. There was evidence that bathing activity increasingly took place outside the current season, particularly in late spring and early autumn, and with events such as Christmas Day swims attracting large numbers of bathers.

Extending the bathing season could therefore better reflect current patterns of use and provide more comprehensive protection for public health during periods when bathing activity remained high but would stretch sampling resources across the longer season. A longer bathing season could potentially result in poorer overall water quality sampling results as wetter weather conditions and less sunlight might increase bacterial and algal counts.

In addition to introducing an expanded bathing season, DAERA was also seeking views on having year round monitoring, or 'winter only' bathing at sites impacted by seasonal problems such as algal blooms.

3. Adopt a more risk-based monitoring approach

DAERA currently monitored each of the Borough's bathing water sites on 20 occasions during the bathing season. Their proposal was that stable, consistently 'Excellent' bathing waters were monitored less frequently and poorer quality waters were monitored more frequently, based on risk factors specific to each site.

4. Refine the criteria for identification

DAERA was seeking views on whether the criteria used to determine if a site qualified for identification as a bathing water should be reviewed, to ensure these remained appropriate and reflected current and future patterns of recreational water use.

Currently, a bathing water site in Northern Ireland could only be formally identified through a legislative amendment to Schedule 1 of The Quality of Bathing Water (Amendment) Regulations (Northern Ireland) 2008.

DAERA proposed moving to an alternative approach already used elsewhere in the UK, whereby a list of bathing waters to be monitored was published annually. This would provide greater flexibility in the identification and de-identification of bathing waters in Northern Ireland. Applications for new bathing waters would still be required, but designation would be achieved through updating the published list rather than making amendments to Schedule 1 through legislation.

5. Strengthen arrangements for candidate sites

Historically, bathing waters were formally identified before routine monitoring was initiated. DAERA proposed that a more structured 'pre-application' or 'candidate site' stage would be a useful approach for managing bathing waters in the future. Under such an approach, selected sites could be monitored for a defined period before any decision was taken on formal identification.

Officers welcomed this proposal, as it would provide a more transparent and consistent approach to the identification of bathing waters. The use of clear assessment criteria, particularly in relation to site safety and water quality, was particularly welcomed and should help ensure that decisions were evidence-based and easily understood by stakeholders.

6. Review the automatic de-identification provision

Currently, where an identified bathing water was considered unlikely to achieve at least a "sufficient" classification, or where doing so would be infeasible or disproportionately expensive, DAERA might de-designate the site and issue permanent advice against bathing following a five-year review period.

DAERA was proposing to replace this approach with a more flexible, case-by-case process that would allow bathing water status to be extended for a specified period where there was a realistic prospect of achieving at least a "sufficient" classification. This would support a more evidence-based approach to decision-making, allowing additional time for water quality improvements while continuing to protect public health and maintain confidence in the bathing waters programme.

7. Ensure monitoring locations reflect actual use

DAERA was requesting that respondents review their local identified bathing water sites and consider whether the current monitoring locations reflected where most people now entered the water and swam.

8. Nominations for new sites

DAERA had amended the nomination form for new sites. Members should note that Council had previously agreed that it proposed Ballyhalbert (Burr

Point) and Portavogie (north beach) as designated bathing waters when the nomination window reopened.

Next Steps

A draft response to the consultation had been prepared by Officers and was attached as Appendix 3. The response included input from Environmental Health & Regulatory Services, Tourism, Parks & Cemeteries, and Estates.

Overall, the changes proposed by DAERA were welcomed, particularly those relating to a bathing season that more accurately reflected how and when the Borough's beaches were used, and to a more transparent nomination process with improved engagement with potential beach operators. This was important where there were concerns about water safety, microbiological quality, or wider pollution issues.

It was worth noting that Council was not required to provide facilities such as showers at designated bathing waters. However, designation could create expectations for investment in infrastructure, site management and visitor facilities over time. Members should therefore carefully consider the potential resource and financial implications of nominating additional bathing waters where the Council agreed to act as Operator. The attached draft consultation response included a request for DAERA to provide funding support for any newly designated sites, although this was unlikely to be adopted.

Members' attention was drawn to Question 6 in the draft response, which related to proposed changes to the length of the bathing season. Officers were proposing that Council's preferred option was to have an extended season that ran from 1st April to 31st October each year. In choosing this option, Officers were aware that Members might decide to choose an alternative option such as there being no recognised season, with water monitoring being undertaken and results being published for the entire year. While this option had merit as sea swimming continued for many enthusiasts at all periods of the year, with increasing popularity of organised events on Christmas Day and New Year's Day, an extended season was preferable for the following reasons:

- DAERA had a limited budget for water quality testing. Extending the bathing season without a corresponding increase in resources would likely reduce sampling frequency, resulting in less reliable data and reduced confidence in water quality classifications.
- Extending the bathing season from 1st April to 31st October would better reflect current patterns of beach use by both residents and visitors. This would ensure that water quality monitoring and public information were available during the period when demand was highest and when coastal tourism activity was most significant.
- Including winter sampling results within annual bathing water classifications might lead to poorer outcomes as a result of seasonal weather conditions, particularly increased rainfall and runoff. This might not accurately reflect water quality during the spring and summer months when bathing waters experienced their highest levels of use.

Summary

DAERA was consulting on proposed changes to the bathing waters policy and legislative framework for Northern Ireland. The consultation covered a range of matters including public information, the length of the bathing season, risk-based monitoring, criteria for identifying bathing waters, candidate site arrangements, de-identification procedures and monitoring locations.

The Council currently acted as Operator for seven designated bathing waters within the Borough and had an important role in providing public information, managing site signage, responding to poor water quality notifications and supporting the identification of potential candidate sites. Officers generally welcomed the direction of the proposed changes, particularly the move towards improved communication with beach users, greater flexibility in the bathing season and a more transparent approach to the nomination and assessment of bathing waters.

The draft consultation response attached at Appendix 3 supported an extended bathing season from 1st April to 31st October, as this would better reflect current patterns of beach use while avoiding the potential drawbacks of year-round classification based on winter sampling results. Members should note, however, that any extension to the bathing season or designation of additional bathing waters might have resource implications for water quality monitoring, signage, officer time and future expectations around site management and infrastructure.

Members were asked to consider the draft response and agree the Council's position on the consultation, including the proposed approach to an extended bathing season.

RECOMMENDED that Council approves the draft consultation response, attached as Appendix 3.

Alderman Smith proposed, seconded by Councillor Cathcart, that the recommendation be adopted.

Alderman Smith agreed with the consultation response and praised the department for producing well-thought-through proposals.

He welcomed the increase in the bathing season and greater flexibility to make it easier for candidate areas to become new bathing sites. He was pleased that there was recognition for more varied uses of waters beyond swimming including sailing, kayaking, and sailboarding.

Kids topper sailing was an example that participants spent more time in the water than in the boat so it should therefore meet the required standards.

The proposer had a concern that all of the Council's bathing sites listed were on the Irish Sea coast and Strangford Lough was missing from the list despite being active for swimming and many water sports.

Alderman Smith noted that the consultation response did mention the Lough as an inland water under Question 13. He asked officers to consider including White Rock in the consultation, describing it as very active for sailing, swimming, sailboarding, kayaking, kitesurfing, and jet skiing.

He argued that White Rock was probably as active as many sites already included in bathing water reviews.

The Director advised that White Rock could be added if Members were in agreement.

The seconder, Councillor Cathcart, was content for White Rock to be included in the proposal and asked about signage and QR codes, recalling that earlier electronic signage had been an issue because it did not work properly and irritated residents. He asked how quickly information was made available to the public in the event of a pollution incident and queried how proactive the Council was in putting out information in that scenario rather than waiting for someone to scan a QR code.

The Director of Active and Healthy Communities advised that samples generally took around a week to be returned so data was not 'real time'. She explained that the consultation referred to modelling used to predict pollution incidents using rainfall, weather, tidal patterns, and similar data. This approach was used in England and Wales, and the aim was to predict pollution incidents rather than wait for delayed sample results.

Councillor McKee welcomed the response and felt that it had struck the right balance and reflected the specific needs of the Borough. He hoped the consultation would result in real change rather than being shelved, raising concern that consultations sometimes led to no action.

A fit-for-purpose regime with better public information and more quality testing was welcome. He felt that people should not have to take risks without access to the facts before entering the water.

RESOLVED, on the proposal of Alderman Smith, seconded by Councillor Cathcart, that the recommendation be adopted and that White Rock be included in the response to Question 13.

12. CONFERENCES AND INVITATIONS

12.1 INVITATION TO APSE ANNUAL SEMINAR 2026 (APPENDIX VI)

PREVIOUSLY CIRCULATED:- Report from the Chief Executive detailing that the Association for Public Service Excellence (APSE) was owned by its members and, working on their behalf, maintained and developed a network of local government officers, managers and councillors from local authorities across England, Northern Ireland, Scotland and Wales.

Working on a not-for-profit basis, APSE was dedicated to promoting excellence in the delivery of frontline services to local communities around the UK. Through the extensive APSE network, more than 300 local authorities and organisations could share information and expertise on vital frontline services, ask for advice and innovative solutions, and develop new, viable ways forward in an effort to help one another.

APSE provided a united national voice for these authorities, supporting them in the development of strong and sustainable public services.

Members of APSE had access to many excellent benefits that helped local authorities to grow. These included regular briefings on the latest policy developments and operational issues, access to groups and forums that allowed authorities to come together to share information and collaborate, and the ability to anonymously ask for and give advice on a range of service issues.

One of the most important benefits APSE membership offered was the opportunity for local authority service providers to have their views voiced and represented at a national level. APSE carefully developed this voice by collaborating with members, and supported it using research, extensive campaigns and consistent media activities.

APSE conducted research, published reports, and campaigned to create a positive role for local government, helping them to deliver high quality, effective and efficient public services. APSE's targeted training programme, regular briefings and inclusive events strove to keep council officers and elected members constantly updated on the latest public service issues. There was also APSE Solutions, an in-house team that worked closely with individual authorities, offering high quality consultancy and interim management support for members and other relevant organisations. APSE had also developed the innovative Performance Networks service, which was the largest national voluntary local government benchmarking service.

Each year APSE also hosted the National Service Awards, celebrating outstanding achievement and innovation in local government service delivery, alongside an evening awards dinner and networking opportunities that brought together councils from across the UK.

As an APSE member, Council were invited to attend the **APSE Annual Seminar 2026: Local Government on the Frontline, Meeting Challenges and Supporting Communities**, with a free full delegate package for Council's main APSE officer contact and a councillor, including the prestigious APSE Service Awards Dinner, to be held at the Crowne Plaza, Liverpool in September 2026.

Alderman Alan McDowell would also be attending the annual seminar in his capacity as APSE Northern Ireland Regional Chair.

Key Issues

This offer recognised the extraordinary efforts of APSE member councils over the past year and gave members the chance to connect, learn and celebrate excellence in local government.

What's included for both delegates:

- Tuesday 15 September - Welcome Reception
- Wednesday 16 September - Day One of the Seminar, APSE's AGM and a Civic Reception
- Thursday 17 September - Day Two of the Seminar, APSE'S Service Awards and 2 free places to annual Charity Dinner

Costs for flights and accommodation were not included as part of the invitation and therefore would be a cost to Council.

This year's seminar, *Local Government on the Frontline, Meeting Challenges and Supporting Communities*, would bring together leading voices across local government to discuss how they could deliver for their communities. The seminar would cover key topics, such as waste and recycling, housing, parks, workforce challenges, clean energy and more.

APSE would also celebrate the exceptional work taking place in councils across the UK at the APSE Service Awards 2026, featuring the prestigious Overall Council of the Year Award.

Next Steps and Summary

The Council was invited to consider the invitation and, if deemed appropriate, nominate a Councillor to attend on its behalf.

RECOMMENDED that Council considers this invitation.

RESOLVED, on the proposal of Alderman McIlveen, seconded by Alderman Smith, that the Council notes the invitation.

(Councillor Kerr left the meeting – 7.19 pm)

12.2 36TH LA TOUCHE LEGACY SEMINAR 11TH FESTIVAL OF HISTORY (APPENDIX VII – IX)

PREVIOUSLY CIRCULATED:- Report from the Chief Executive detailing that Ards and North Down Borough Council had received an invitation from Wicklow County Council to attend the 36th La Touche Legacy Seminar and 11th Festival of History, which would take place on Saturday 19 September 2026 at Greystones Golf Club, County Wicklow.

The seminar would feature presentations by Professor Frank Barry, David McCullagh (RTÉ) and Stephen Collins, covering aspects of Ireland's economic, political and social history.

The cost of attendance was €50 per person, which included all lectures, refreshments and lunch.

Council was requested to consider whether it wished to be represented at the event and, if so, to nominate Member(s) to attend on its behalf. Further details of the programme and speakers were attached for Members' information.

RECOMMENDED that Council considers this invitation.

Alderman McRandal proposed, seconded by Councillor Boyle that the recommendation be adopted and that Alderman McDowell attends.

Alderman McIlveen was unable to support the proposal. Referring to the information attached to the report, he argued that the event had no relevance to the Council's work and could not support the nomination of an Elected Member to attend.

Alderman Adair agreed with that view and saw no benefit in the conference for the Council or its ratepayers. He recalled that the Conference had been running since the legacy Ards Borough Council days, around 15 years, possibly longer. It had often sparked debate in the former Council but there had not been any nominations for many years.

He felt that the Council should be prudent with ratepayers' money and Councillors should only attend conferences if they brought benefit to the Council or its ratepayers. He described it as a holiday or a junket with no benefit and if Members wanted to go, they should cover their own costs.

On being put to the meeting, with 13 voting FOR, 13 voting AGAINST, 6 ABSTAINED and 8 ABSENT, the Mayor used his casting vote in favour and the proposal was CARRIED.

RESOLVED, on the proposal of Alderman McRandal, seconded by Councillor Boyle, that the recommendation be adopted and that Alderman McDowell attends.

(Alderman Adair declared an interest in Item 13 and left the Council Chamber – 7.25 pm)

13. SEALING DOCUMENTS

RESOLVED, on the proposal of Alderman Graham, seconded by Councillor W Irvine, that the Seal of the Council be affixed to the following documents:-

- (a) Grants of Rights of Burials – D41407 – D41451
- (b) Deed of Transfer – ANDBC to NI Water – Land at Dickson Park, Ballygowan
- (c) Grant of Easement (x3) – ANDBC to John Burgess

(d) Application for Rectification of Boundaries (x3) – ANDBC and John Burgess

RESOLVED, on the proposal of Alderman Graham, seconded by Councillor W Irvine, that the Transfer of Rights of Burial be agreed.

(Alderman Adair returned to the Council Chamber – 7.27 pm)

14. TRANSFER OF RIGHTS OF BURIAL

The Mayor notified Members of the following Transfer of Rights of Burial:

Clandeboyne cemetery section KX grave 4382

Mrs M McCullough – Margaret Foster

RESOLVED, on the proposal of Alderman Graham, seconded by Councillor W Irvine, that the Transfer of Rights of Burial be agreed.

15. NOTICE OF MOTION STATUS REPORT

(APPENDIX X)

PREVIOUSLY CIRCULATED:- Report from the Chief Executive detailing that attached was a Status Report in respect of Notices of Motion.

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

RECOMMENDED that the Council notes the report.

Councillor Cathcart proposed, seconded by Councillor McCollum, that the recommendation be adopted.

Councillor Cathcart queried Notice of Motion 370 noting that it related to a Council review of bylaws. He welcomed that process but was aware of Council and NIEA bins being set alight over the summer from disposable barbecues at beaches and parks. He suggested that Council designate sites with dedicated disposable barbecue bins and that this provision be separate from the wider review of bylaws which would take a long time to process.

Councillor Cathcart asked if the Director would be able to take that forward within the existing Notice of Motion or if a new motion would be required.

The Director of Environmental Services advised that the request could be considered without a specific notice of motion as reviews of bins took place periodically. The Director would raise it with the relevant team and report back.

Councillor McCollum referred to Notice of Motion 687 which related to community safety resources. The issue of antisocial behaviour became especially pressing in the summer and the last few months had seen a worrying escalation. While she felt that Council generally handled this issue well, a seven to eight month wait was unacceptable.

She referred to the ask of the Notice of Motion to look at existing resources, identifying funding requirements and increasing the number of community safety officers compared with other council areas. She asked how that process was going and how much longer the Council would have to wait. She suggested that some interim measures could be considered.

The Director of Active and Healthy Communities advised that the issue had been considered through the Council-wide transformation and restructure process and the potential for realigning resources was being examined. It was also a top priority for the newly appointed Head of Service and update report would follow to an upcoming meeting of the Active and Healthy Communities Committee.

In a further matter, Councillor Wray referred to Notice of Motion 713 which related to the tragic death of 16 year old DICE leader and Army Cadet Jaidyn Rice on the 8th July 2025 and tasked officers to work with the Rice family to create a bench honouring Jaidyn's contribution to her community.

He felt that the scheduled timeline for Member updates seemed too long. He also noted that the anniversary of Jaidyn's death had recently passed and asked the Director for an update on the conversations that were due to take place.

The Director advised that a report was already drafted and should be issued at the next Committee meeting in September.

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

16. NOTICES OF MOTION

16.1 Notice of Motion submitted by Councillor Cathcart and Councillor McClean

That this Council recognises that our city, towns and villages in our Borough are summer destinations for many. Therefore the Council agrees to bring an officers' report back on reviving the annual 'Dressing the Town' budget which was previously provided for banners and bunting and other decorative measures during the summer months. The aim of such a budget would be to provide visitors and residents with a summer welcome to our Borough, especially our seaside destinations.

RESOLVED, on the proposal of Councillor Cathcart, seconded by Councillor McClean, that the Notice of Motion be referred to the Place and Prosperity Committee.

EXCLUSION OF PUBLIC AND PRESS

AGREED, on the proposal of Alderman Armstrong-Cotter, seconded by Alderman McIlveen, that the public and press be excluded from the following items of confidential business.

17. EXTENSION OF TENDER FOR THE PROVISION OF LEGIONELLA SERVICES - LOT 1

*****IN CONFIDENCE*****

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

SCHEDULE 6 3. Exemption: relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person

Background

To ensure compliance across Council facilities, officers procured specialist contractors to provide Legionella services. To deliver a flexible and effective service, the tender was divided into two lots, Lot 1 and Lot 2.

Key Issues

Both contractors had been contacted to confirm their agreement to extend their contract for a further period of one year.

The contractor for Lot 2 agreed and the extension was approved at the June 2026 Environment Committee.

The contractor for Lot 1 has agreed, with a percentage rise in their rates.

Next Steps

Upon agreement of the extension of Lot 1, Council officers now recommend to extend the contract for Lot 1, for a further period of one year as detailed in the original tender documents, until 31 July 2027.

Summary

The Council was asked to approve the extension.

RECOMMENDED that the Council approves the extension as proposed.

The recommendation was adopted.

18. EXTENSION TO THE CONTRACT FOR THE RECEIPT AND PROCESSING OF MIXED DRY RECYCLABLES (LOT 1)

*****IN CONFIDENCE*****

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

SCHEDULE 6 3. Exemption: relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person

Background

The existing contract for sorting and reprocessing of kerbside collected mixed dry recyclables is due to come to the end of its seven-year term on 29 September 2026. Council officers have been determining future contractual requirements to ensure service continuity.

Key Issues

The contractor was contacted to confirm their agreement to extend their contract for a further period of six months.

The contract extension would be on the terms of the original contract. The contractor has agreed to an extension on that basis.

Next Steps

Upon agreement of the extension, officers now recommend to extend the contract for a further period of six months as detailed in the original terms of contract, from 30 September 2026 until 31 March 2027.

Summary

The Council was asked to approve the extension.

RECOMMENDED that the Council approves the extension as proposed.

The recommendation was adopted.

(Councillor Chambers left the meeting having declared an interest in Item 19 – 7.35 pm).

19. **LEISURE DELIVERY MODEL UPDATE** (APPENDIX XI – XIV)

*****IN CONFIDENCE*****

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

SCHEDULE 6 3. Exemption: relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person

PREVIOUSLY CIRCULATED:- Report from the Chief Executive detailing that at the 15th June 2026 Active and Healthy Communities Committee it was recommended that the Council approves that an agency model is adopted for the new outsourced leisure contract and approves the approach to contract length, utilities, maintenance, profit share and procurement procedure (Appendix 4).

The paper was deferred, and additional information was requested to allow Members to have sight of an updated report.

The recommendation was adopted.

20. REQUEST FOR WAYLEAVE FROM NIE - BRIDGE STREET, COMBER
(APPENDIX XI – XIV)

*****IN CONFIDENCE*****

NOT FOR PUBLICATION SCHEDULE 6: 5 – A CLAIM TO LEGAL PROFESSIONAL PRIVILEGE.

Council was asked to consider a request from NIE for a Wayleave at Bridge Street, Comber. It was recommended that the Council acceded to the request. The recommendation was agreed.

21. REQUEST FOR A LICENCE WITH NIHE IN RESPECT OF LAND ACQUISITION AT MAIN STREET, CONLIG
(APPENDIX XV)

*****IN CONFIDENCE*****

NOT FOR PUBLICATION SCHEDULE 6: 5 – A CLAIM TO LEGAL PROFESSIONAL PRIVILEGE.

Council was asked to approve the request for a licence with the NIHE in order to build a War Memorial at Main Street, Conlig. The recommendation was agreed.

22. REQUEST FOR A SITE COMPOUND - WARD PARK REDEVELOPMENT WORKS
(APPENDIX XVI)

*****IN CONFIDENCE*****

NOT FOR PUBLICATION SCHEDULE 6: 5 – A CLAIM TO LEGAL PROFESSIONAL PRIVILEGE.

Council was asked to approve a request for a licence for a site compound to facilitate the redevelopment works in Ward Park. The recommendation was agreed.

READMITTANCE OF PUBLIC AND PRESS

AGREED, on the proposal of Alderman McIlveen, seconded by Councillor Wray, that the public and press be readmitted to the meeting.

TERMINATION OF MEETING

The meeting terminated at 8.20 pm.

C.2026.07.29 PM

26

ITEM 7

27

ARDS AND NORTH DOWN BOROUGH COUNCIL

A hybrid meeting (in person and via Zoom) of the Planning Committee was held in the Council Chamber, Church Street, Newtownards, on Tuesday 4 August 2026 at 7.00 pm.

PRESENT:

In the Chair: Councillor McCollum

Aldermen: Graham McIlveen
McAlpine (Zoom) Smith
McDowell

Councillors: Cathcart McClean
Harbinson (Zoom) McKee (7.18pm Zoom)
Hennessy Morgan (Zoom)
Kendall (7.07pm Zoom) Smart
Kerr (7.07pm Zoom) Wray

Officers: Director of Place and Prosperity (B Dorrian), Head of Planning and Building Control (A McCullough) and Democratic Services Officer (P Foster)

1. APOLOGIES

The Chairman (Councillor McCollum) sought apologies at this stage and noted that no apologies had been received.

NOTED.

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

The Chairman sought Declarations of Interest at this stage.

No Declarations of Interests were made but Members were reminded of their ability to declare at any time throughout the meeting.

NOTED.

3. MATTERS ARISING FROM THE PLANNING COMMITTEE MINUTES OF 7 JULY 2026

PREVIOUSLY CIRCULATED:- Copy of the above.

AGREED on the proposal of Alderman Graham, seconded by Councillor Wray, that the minutes be noted.

4. PLANNING APPLICATIONS

4.1 LA06/2024/0576/O – DWELLING, GARAGE AND ALL ASSOCIATED SITE WORKS (Appendix I)

PREVIOUSLY CIRCULATED:- Case Officer's report.

DEA: Bangor East & Donaghadee

Committee Interest: – Application called in by a member of the Planning Committee

Proposal: Dwelling, garage and all associated site works

Site Location: Land immediately to the rear of 54a High Bangor Road, Donaghadee

Recommendation: Refuse Planning Permission

The Head of Planning guided Members through her presentation to consider an application for a proposed dwelling, garage and all associated site works at land immediately to the rear of 54a High Bangor Road, Donaghadee.

This application for a dwelling was before Members as it had been called in from the delegated list at the start of July for the reason provided.

Members were shown a number of slides which depicted the overall geographical context, identified the site by a yellow circle to west of the settlement of Donaghadee, in the countryside, and off the protected route. A further ortho and map overview of the site, showing the application site submitted as including the dwelling and curtilage of no. 54a to the immediate north was also shown. A close up ortho of the site demonstrated that the topography which was quite a bit higher than the adjacent land to the west (number 56) and sloped down to the north of the site to the High Bangor Road. Members were advised that as this was an outline application to establish the principle of development, matters regarding siting, design, external appearance, access and landscaping were reserved for future consent.

By way of background Members were advised that number 56 was allowed on appeal back in 2012 under the CTY 10 policy for a dwelling on a farm, given it was previously the site of a horticultural/nursery business. That approval was amended by a further approval in 2018, and then by a further change of house type in 2019 which was what

had been constructed on site. This was to explain the elongated nature of the site as the nursery buildings appeared to have been located to the very south of the site.

The Head of Planning noted that Members would by now be very familiar with the policy context contained within PPS 21 – Sustainable Development in the Countryside. It stated that there were a range of types of development which in principle were considered to be acceptable in the countryside and that would contribute to the aims of sustainable development. The first of those was a dwelling sited within an existing cluster of buildings in accordance with Policy CTY 2a. Other types of development would only be permitted where there were overriding reasons why that development was essential. Policy CTY 2a stated that Planning Permission would be granted for a dwelling at an existing cluster of development provided six criteria were met. There was no justification or amplification text to Policy CTY 2a to defined what constituted a cluster of development; however, the first three criteria gave an indication of meaning.

(Councillors Kendall and Kerr joined the meeting at this stage via Zoom – 7.07pm)

The first criterion required that the cluster of development lay outside of a farm and consisted of four or more buildings (excluding ancillary buildings) of which at least three were dwellings. This suggested that an existing cluster of development was to be formed by buildings and this was reinforced in criterion three whereby a cluster must be associated with a focal point such as a social/community building/facility if not located at a crossroads. The second criterion required that a cluster appeared as a visual entity in the local landscape. The Planning Service considered that there was a cluster of development formed by the dwellings outlined in red on the slide shown to Members. As an aside, number 65 was not a dwelling, but was previously a dwelling which was granted planning permission for a replacement dwelling which was now known as number 60 Stockbridge Road. The approval was conditioned that the original dwelling was to be demolished prior to commencement of the replacement dwelling. The agent asserted that number 56 was part of the cluster, despite the actual dwelling being located considerably further to the south, given its frontage with wall and gates to the High Bangor Road. Nevertheless, it was accepted that there was a cluster of development in line with criterion one of CTY 2a.

As stated the second criterion required the cluster to appear as a visual entity. The Planning Service disputed this element, as it was considered that the dwellings referenced read more as roadside development. Members were shown a slide which included photos of the approach from the west along High Bangor Road towards the Stockbridge Road junction, where number 60 and number 54 were apparent at the roadside, whilst number 56 was seen located on higher ground to the south. It was not considered by Planning that the Garden Centre signage, nor the wall to the front of number 56 contributed to a feeling of a visual entity. It was noted that the approach from the opposite direction, heading east from Donaghadee was considered that roadside boundaries marred the appreciation of any cluster. The approach to the junction with High Bangor Road from the Stockbridge Road, where it was considered that only number 60 Stockbridge Road on the left of the shot, and the roof of number 54a could

be seen. The Head of Planning stated that she did not consider that the boundary wall to number 56 could be considered as the actual dwelling could not be seen from this perspective.

Turning to criterion 3 which required that the identified cluster was associated with a focal point such as a social/community building/facility or was located at a crossroads. Whilst the wording of the policy did not provide an exhaustive list, it was considered that it inferred that a focal point be some sort of building or facility where the local community could meet/socialise. In line with the appeal decision 2020/A0122, issued (which was more up to date than any of the decisions cited by the agent), the Commissioner opined that to his mind 'associated with' meant that there should be a visual and or physical connection between the 'cluster' of development and the focal point.

The site was not located at a crossroads, it was located to the rear of development at a T junction, where two roads met which was not a crossroads, and more than 215m from the crossroads to the west of the site. In an appeal decision (2021/A0119) issued in May 2023, the Commissioner considered that an alleged crossroads, located at least 200-250m from the grouping of buildings, could not be considered to be located at a crossroads in line with policy requirements. Donaghadee Garden Centre was located some 360m from the boundary of no. 60 Stockbridge Road. In another more recent appeal decision 2022/A0014 issued in January 2023, the Commissioner considered a church as a valid community facility but given that there was a significant gap of around 100m between it and the nearest building in the 'cluster' it was considered not to read as part of the same visual entity as the main cluster of development. Given that there was no explicit requirement for it to be seen in the same context, the Commissioner also stated that 'in spatial terms, the church was not physically within the cluster of development. In looking up the ordinary meaning of 'associated with' and 'focal point' Members' attention was drawn to the fact that in the case of reliance upon Donaghadee Garden Centre, it was considered that it was too far removed from the 'cluster' – given the distance. As such the PAC accepted that the first three criteria of Policy CTY 2a defined what a cluster of development was, and it was therefore vital that all three criteria be met for a dwelling to be permitted. Planning contended that the proposal failed Criterion 2 and Criterion 3.

Turning to Criterion 4 which required the site 'to provide a suitable degree of enclosure, and to be bounded on at least two sides with other development in the cluster'. Members were shown photos which demonstrated the relationship of the site to number 56 which the agent contended must be considered as part of the cluster. If Planning did consider number 56 as part of the cluster, it was considered that the boundary with number 56 did not provide a suitable degree of enclosure given the lack of clear definition of a boundary and the ground level of the proposed site in the context of the adjacent land. Whilst the Case Officer Report considered that the site had existing boundaries to the west with number 56, as could be seen from the photo, it was likely it would require to be supplemented to provide a suitable degree of enclosure, certainly in the context of the next slide. Members were further advised how the relationship of the

site on the ground with number 54a, and number 56 and that Planning would contend that a dwelling, even single storey, would not be absorbed into the existing cluster (if it was considered that it were a cluster). A further slide was shown which demonstrated further that there were likely to be long range views of the dwelling, when viewed from the Kylestone Road to the south west of the site, and that was why it was considered that it would intrude into the open countryside given that there were views 'through' the site at present from this public viewpoint. Finally, it was accepted that the proposed development, subject to appropriate mitigation at any design stage, would not adversely impact on residential amenity.

Given that Planning considered the proposal to fail four out of the six criteria under CTY 2a, consideration was now given to examine it against Policy CTY 8 – Ribboning. The planning history to number 54a dating back to 1991 and 1992 showed the boundary of number 54a to consist of that immediately surrounding the dwelling. Whereas later history under X/2007/0672/F referred to approval for a single storey extension, porch, garage and increase in curtilage, which now formed the red line of this application site. In this respect Planning considered the site to form the back garden to number 54a. In terms of the exception test in Policy CTY 8, Planning did not consider that this was a 'gap site' in an otherwise substantial and continuously built up frontage for the purposes of the policy, rather development on it would constitute backland development.

The proposal was considered to comply with Policy CTY 13 but whilst the Case Officer report considered that a modest dwelling would integrate into the natural rural area, as could be seen, there would be concerns in relation to the ground levels, finished floor levels and ridge height would require to be considered carefully. Again the Case Officer Report considered that the proposal did not conflict with Policy CTY 14 on Rural Character, but as discussed any dwelling would require to be sensitively designed to overcome any potential impact from the view points identified. All consultees were content and there had been no representations submitted.

To conclude, the Head of Planning stated that whilst Planning was acutely aware of the various case law, examples cited relating to not having to slavishly apply policy, the objectives of PPS 21 were set out for Members consideration. Paragraph 5 of PPS 21 set out that the policies therein set out the main planning considerations in assessing proposals for development in the countryside and they should prevail unless there were overriding policy or material considerations that outweighed them and justified a contrary decision. Again, Policy CTY 1 set out those types of development which were considered in principle acceptable in the countryside and set out that other types of development would only be permitted where there were overriding reasons why the development was essential and could not be located in a settlement. Given that the professional planning judgement was that the proposal did not find favour in any of the policies within PPS 21, it was considered that there were no overriding reasons why the development was essential and could not be located in a settlement, and as such it was recommended that planning permission was refused.

The Chair invited questions to the Officer for clarification.

Alderman McIlveen noted that number 56 was not being considered as part of the cluster and sought further clarification on why that was the case. The Head of Planning stated the reason for that was that number 56 itself was set quite a bit back from the existing cluster. Alderman McIlveen referred to the visuals going along the High Bangor Road and noted the buildings and wall of number 56 which could be seen and noted Members were being advised to 'ignore' that as part of their considerations. The Head of Planning advised that the Policy referred to 'buildings in a cluster'. Alderman McIlveen stated that what Members were being asked to consider was whether or not there was a non countryside aspect to this in terms of unnatural assertions. He added that it was a manmade wall rather than a natural hedge. The Head of Planning stated that it had not been accepted that the type of development contributed to the cluster which consisted of buildings, three of which were dwellings. Alderman McIlveen reiterated that Members were being asked to consider visual entity and as such he was exploring what could and could not be taken into consideration. Continuing he referred to the definition of a cluster which had been included in the presentation adding that Members were being asked by the Applicant to take into account the Garden Centre as the focal point associated with this cluster. As such he asked if there was anything else Members needed to be taking into consideration given reference in the Applicant's notes on Building on Tradition. The Head of Planning stated that had been rejected given that they were not on a par and while the Garden Centre was in the vicinity it was quite a distance from the cluster of buildings.

At this stage Councillor Cathcart referred to the attached Addendum and asked if number 56 was essentially backland development. In response the Head of Planning advised that Planners would not consider that as number 56 had been developed in a very specific set of circumstances and as such had not been considered as backland development. As the proposed site sat behind an existing dwelling it was considered backland development and not a dwelling which had an extensive garden to the front of it. Councillor Cathcart commented that as it was at the rear of the other buildings it was a visual consideration. The Head of Planning stated that she did not agree with that as it was not at the rear of other buildings and instead was set back from the road with an extensive garden to the front of it. As such it was not considered backland development.

Councillor Morgan sought clarification on the distance between number 54a and number 56 and the Head of Planning estimated that to be 100 metres.

Alderman McAlpine referred to figure 11 of the Report which showed an area of hardstanding and asked if that was connected to either the farm or nursery buildings. The Head of Planning recalled that there had previously been an application for a large garage for the storage of vintage cars, and that she could only opine that it may have been originally constructed for that purpose, however that application did not proceed.

Councillor Wray sought clarification around the distance of the Garden Centre and the proposed site was 350m and referring to an Appeal mentioned in the report he asked if distance was the only rationale on which this was being refused. In response the Head

of Planning commented that she believed there were a number of contributory factors. She added that the distance referred to on the slide from the Garden Centre to number 60 (as being considered the edge of the cluster) was 359 metres and as such the distance to the proposed site would be even greater.

The Chair introduced Mr A Stephens who was speaking in support of the application.

His address to the Committee was summarised as follows.

Mr Stephens thanked Members for the opportunity to speak in support of this application, and against the recommendation of officers to refuse planning permission. He stated that the starting position on all planning applications was that there was a presumption to grant permission unless there was demonstrable harm or interests of acknowledged importance. In this circumstance harm to the countryside. Nowhere in the 16 page Committee Report before Members did officers demonstrate that the proposal caused harm to the countryside. The concern was that the proposal did not fit neatly within either Policy CTY2a or CTY8. However, that did not mean it was unacceptable and if it did not cause demonstrable harm then common sense indicated that refusal would be difficult to sustain. He suggested the Report was devoid of demonstrable harm and demonstrated why it did not meet policy criteria, rather than demonstrate how it harmed the countryside at this location.

In respect of third party objections and consultees there were no other issues in play, as there were no third party objections to the proposed single dwelling from any of the adjacent properties or those opposite (No.54,54a 56, 60, 63 & 65 High Bangor Road). Nor were there any objections from DfI Roads, NI Water, Environmental Health Department or NIEA Water Management Unit.

Continuing Mr Stephens stated that case law had repeatedly set out some well-established principles in the application of planning policy, and in exercising balanced decision making as detailed below:

Tesco Stores Ltd v Secretary of State for the Environment & Others [1995] All ER 636

Lord Hoffman states – “Provided that the planning authority has regard to all material considerations, it is at liberty to give them whatever weight the planning authority thinks or no weight at all.

Regina v Rochdale Borough Council ex parte Milne [2000] EWHC 650

“The plan is complied with as a whole even if there has been a minor technical breach of the policies contained within it”.

In the matter of an application by Belfast Chamber of Trade & Commerce, Belfast City Council & North Down Borough Council for Judicial Review [2001] NICA 6

Carswell LCJ states – “...the decision maker is not obligated to adhere to each point [of a planning policy], and is entitled to override or depart from any part it considers it justified”.

In the matter of an application by James Stewart for Judicial Review [2003] NICA 4

Carswell LCJ states – “Planning policies are not a “straight jacket” and do not have to be slavishly followed in all circumstances.....and that the determining body must have regard to policy, but need not follow it.

Lisburn Development Consortium's application for Judicial Review [2007] BNIL 96

Kerr J states – “the nature of a planning policy is to give guidance to planners as to the general approach to be taken to regularly encountered planning problems.....The purpose of such statement is to provide general guidance; it is not designed to provide an immutable of rules”.

The overarching approach to all planning policy is the “no harm” test as per the South Lakeland DC v SoS for the Environment (1992).

Continuing Mr Stephen referred to Policy CTY2a – New Dwellings in Existing Clusters - Criterion 2 – Visual Entity.

The analysis in respect of number 56 contradicted the assessment in spatial terms (physical / visual) in the remainder of the report. It failed to pay regard to number 56's large walls and gates along the road frontage, which clearly present a developed appearance to the road irrespective of the dwelling being set back. There was no consideration of the sequential awareness of development when travelling along the road in either direction, or that a nucleus of six dwellings would be uncharacteristic of the locality, which consists for the most of single dwellings strung out along the road frontage of High Bangor Road.

Criterion 3 – Focal point

The Committee report ignored appeal 2019/A0024, Ballygowan Road, Comber which came before the Council's Planning Committee. It was allowed at appeal, and paragraph(s) 18 – 19 considered the correct policy interpretation that there was no requirement in Policy CTY 2a or BoT that any proposal be visually linked with any relevant focal point. With Pages 68-9 of BoT providing diagrams showing more than one focal point within a cluster with suitable sites physically distant from the community facilities/buildings but still considered acceptable.

Criterion 4 – Enclosure

The flawed analysis regarding number 56 was engaged as the site was clearly

physically contained on two sides by numbers 54a and 56 as witnessed in all the maps, aerals and figures in the report, and on the ground.

Criterion 5 – Rounding Off

It was clearly rounding off development at this location and would have no impact on the existing character or appearance of the area, given its physical relationship. The flawed assessment of number 56 had resulted in Parts 2,4 and 5 being deemed to be unacceptable. Mr Stephens stated the assessment was neither balanced nor objective and as demonstrated it could not stand up to scrutiny.

Policy CTY8 – Ribbon Development

Mr Stephens noted the report accepted that there was a substantial and continuously built-up frontage (SCBUF) at this location. The building line was staggered within the SCBUF and number 54a was located to the side of the plot. It was fundamentally wrong to suggest that the site could not have frontage and be discounted on that basis. The judgement in *Burdle v Secretary of State for the Environment* [1972] 3 ALL ER 240 and the consideration of the planning unit would engaged, as the proposed plot could be split to provide two planning units with frontage.

CTY 14 – Rural Character

In utter contradiction to the assessment on the visual entity (P.7) “very little awareness of any buildings” it was now deemed the proposed dwelling with other buildings would result in a build-up of development. Unfortunately, Mr Stephens stated officers could not argue it both ways, and this demonstrated a lack of balanced assessment in this report. The fact remained that a dwelling would be of no consequence in this landscape setting and that was apparent in the report.

By way of summing up Mr Stephens stated that taking the matters in the round, it would not harm the countryside. Any perceived minor infringement with the letter of policy criteria should be weighed against the total lack of harm. For this reason he requested that the Committee overturned the recommendation to refuse however if Members were not comfortable with that he suggested that they undertook a site visit to see for themselves. Mr Stephens thanked Members for their time and indicated that he was happy to answer any questions.

The Chair invited questions to the speaker and Alderman McIlveen referred to the two key points he had raised with the Head of Planning around the cluster and the boundary on both sides. There was also the issue of whether or not to include the house in considerations or if it should be excluded due to the previous planning history. Alderman McIlveen sought Mr Stephens’ view on that. In response Mr Stephens commented that as alluded to under PPS 21 and CTY14 which considered Rural Character and developed appearance, he stated that number 56 had road frontage which could not counted as it was set back. His argument was that if it had road frontage along with

large scale walls out he could not see how that could be ruled out. Referring to the second point, Alderman McIlveen noted that there was not a crossroads as such and reliance was being placed upon the Garden Centre as a focal point for the cluster. Given its distance from the site he asked what the argument would be for considering it as part of this cluster. Mr Stephens referred to various appeals and their outcomes and the point he was making was that Building on Tradition was a consideration and a focal point could be physically dispersed from the cluster. He stated that the Garden Centre should be considered as a focal point particularly given its association with the property at number 56. At this stage Mr Stephens made mention of another cluster situated around number 36 Stockbridge Road. As such he suggested there had been a pattern of development based around both those clusters with the Garden Centre being used as a focal point. Alderman McIlveen raised a final point around the distances mentioned in the report around the cluster and Garden Centre and asked if he was aware of what those distances were. In response Mr Stephens advised that he would not have those figures to hand adding that everyone was aware the Garden Centre was there. Mr Stephens went on to suggest there was some confusion within the officer's report around visual entity

Mr Stephens returned to the public gallery.

The Chair invited questions to the Officer for clarification.

Councillor Hennessy sought clarification around Mr Stephens' last comments about visual entity. The Head of Planning commented that consideration had been given to the criteria around a cluster of development appearing as a visual entity in tandem with CTY14 and PPS20, which she proceeded to read out to Members. Within the Report officers did not consider that the cluster appeared as visual entity, consideration under PPS 14 confirmed that it would not integrate. She was advised that was not what was meant and following further consideration she noted that Mr Stephens' argument was that it was while it was not a visual entity the build-up was acceptable. He had made reference to a contradiction in assessment on Page 7 of the report which discussed Criteria 2. Thanking the officer for her comments Councillor Hennessy asked if that was what Members were being asked to consider the fact that there was no visual entity. She advised that Policy CTY 2a was one of the exceptions in the countryside and the PAC accepted that it had to comply with the first three to be acceptable for a dwelling. While officers believed that it met the first criteria it did not meet the second or third criteria. Further policies were considered after that.

(Councillor Kerr left the meeting at this stage – 7.43pm)

Alderman McIlveen proposed, seconded by Councillor Cathcart, that planning permission be approved.

The proposer Alderman McIlveen stated that he believed the proposal met the Criteria in Policy CTY 2a as he believed number 56 needed to be considered as part of that cluster. He added that the ornate walls already in place added to the visual impact and

as such number 56 clearly came into play. He added that the site was also bounded on two sides and given what Members had heard in respect of those buildings which were associated with the Garden Centre it should be considered as a social building under the Policy. Continuing he stated that he did not believe there was any negative impact on the countryside by granting planning approval. As such he felt it was appropriate to approve the application and give officers delegated powers to construct the appropriate conditions.

Commenting as second Councillor Cathcart concurred with the comments which had been made in terms of visual impact and the inclusion of number 56. He added that the reason Planning Policies were in place was to ensure there was no harm to the countryside in terms of development. Continuing Councillor Cathcart expressed the view that he did not believe this proposal would cause demonstrable harm to the countryside and as this was for Outline approval conditions could be included which would ensure that it was appropriately integrated into the countryside.

Alderman McDowell referred to the speaker's comments that it would do no demonstrable harm to the countryside stating that he did not necessarily agree with that. Rules and regulations were in place to stop the overdevelopment of the countryside and one thing which he had not heard mentioned was the matter of 'need' and for that reason he would be voting against it.

Councillor Smart acknowledged why the proposal had been made given the report which was before them but was keen to get a wider perspective from the officer on the implications of changing the recommendation. He indicated that he would be keen to know if this would create a precedent for building in the countryside and how repeatable such a development could be. Continuing he noted that tiered development was often more prevalent in urban areas and asked if there was potential for such development to occur on the right hand side of this proposed development. In response the Head of Planning indicated that she could not comment on a precedent being set as each site needed to be determined on its own merits. In terms of tiered development if approved it would need to be conditioned that the position of the dwelling would need to be where it was marked on the plan. If number 56 was being taken into consideration its front garden could potentially be opened up for development, but officers were only able to consider what was currently before them.

Councillor Hennessy referred to the focal point commenting that the distance between the Garden Centre and the cluster was getting smaller as the meeting was continuing. He was in agreement that number 56 did not form part of the cluster and therefore he agreed with the officer's recommendation to refuse planning permission.

At this stage Alderman Smith acknowledged that the two issues were the focal point and whether number 56 was included as part of the cluster. In his opinion the distance was far too great for the Garden Centre to be a focal point for this development. In terms of the cluster he commented that if number 56 was included you would double the

circumference of the cluster and as such taking all of that into consideration he would not be able to support the proposal.

By way of summing up Alderman McIlveen referred to Alderman Smith's comments around clusters and he reminded Members that a cluster was a visual test. On approach you were not just approaching the house but you also had the ornate wall. He added that what Members were being asked to take into consideration was that this application would not cause any additional harm to the countryside and because the cluster was already there bound on two sides and to add a further building to that would not cause any additional harm. Considering what was associated with the focal point the policy did not state that it had to be in the cluster but could be associated with it and that was up to Members to take into consideration.

On being put to the meeting, with 4 voting FOR, 10 voting AGAINST, 1 ABSTAINING and 1 ABSENT, the proposal was LOST.

The voting was as follows:

FOR (4)	AGAINST (10)	ABSTAINED (1)	ABSENT (1)
Aldermen	Aldermen	Councillor	Councillor
Graham	McDowell	McCollum	Kerr
McIlveen	McAlpine		
	Smith		
Councillors	Councillors		
Cathcart	Hennessy		
Wray	Harbinson		
	Morgan		
	Smart		
	McKee		
	Kendall		
	McClean		

Alderman McDowell proposed, seconded by Alderman Smith, that the recommendation be adopted and that planning permission be refused.

On being put to the meeting, with 10 voting FOR, 4 voting AGAINST, 1 ABSTAINING and 1 ABSENT, the proposal was declared CARRIED.

The voting was as follows:

FOR (10)	AGAINST (4)	ABSTAINED (1)	ABSENT (1)
Aldermen	Aldermen	Councillor	Councillor
McDowell	Graham	McCollum	Kerr
McAlpine	McIlveen		
Smith			
	Councillors		

Councillors	Cathcart
Hennessy	Wray
Harbinson	
Morgan	
Smart	
McKee	
Kendall	
McClean	

RESOLVED, on the proposal of Alderman McDowell, seconded by Alderman Smith, that the recommendation be adopted and that planning permission be refused.

4.2 LA06/2025/0330/F – PROPOSED ALTERATIONS TO, AND EXTENSION OF, THE EXISTING VACANT DICKSON’S HOME AND GARDEN CENTRE TO ACCOMMODATE A NEW GARDEN AND ANTIQUE CENTRE WITH ANCILLARY FARM/DELI SHOP/CAFÉ, RESTAURANT, LANDSCAPING AND CHILDREN’S PLAY AREA. DEVELOPMENT INCLUDES THE RECONFIGURATION OF THE EXISTING CAR PARK AND ALL OTHER ASSOCIATED SITE AND ACCESS WORKS(Appendix II)

PREVIOUSLY CIRCULATED:- Case Officer’s report.

DEA: Holywood & Clandeboye

Committee Interest: – Application within Major Category

Proposal: Proposed alterations to, and extension of, the existing vacant Dickson’s Home and Garden Centre to accommodate a new garden and antique centre with ancillary farm/deli shop/café, restaurant, landscaping and children’s play area. Development includes the reconfiguration of the existing car park and all other associated site and access works.

Site Location: Former Dickson’s Home and Garden Centre, 77-79 Cootehall Road, Bangor, BT19 1UP

Recommendation: Grant Planning Permission

The Head of Planning outlined the Case Officer’s Report,

She proceeded to guide Members through her Presentation stating that they would be familiar with the site at the junction of Cootehall Road, and the A2 Bangor-Belfast Road, Bangor, which was the former site of Dickson’s Garden Centre.

The site was located immediately west of and just outside the designated settlement of Bangor, on the Cootehall Road which led down to the settlement of Crawfordsburn. The A2 to the immediate south was a protected route, and the site was in the countryside. The buildings associated with the previous use still existed on site, alongside a number of buildings associated with other previous uses, such as Tobermore (decorative stone/paving), a conservatory showroom, as well as Clearly Aquatics, a pond equipment and aquatics dealer which was still operational. Members were shown a slide which consisted of orthos showing the site in 2005 when the garden centre and associated restaurant etc were operational, and more recently in 2022.

The proposal had been submitted by the owner of On The Square Emporium, currently located in the Belfast Harbour Estate, which was a successful business hosting furniture, décor, collectibles, salvage, ironmongery and much more. The intention was to move that business to this site but merge it with a Victorian garden centre theme. The proposed uses would consist of:

- An area for sale of bulky goods
- Antique and craft centre
- Area for sale of seasonal goods
- Antique centre
- Restaurant
- Coffee station
- Garden centre
- Farm shop and deli café
- Outside garden retail area
- Informal children's play area
- Ancillary storage and servicing areas
- And offices and storage at first floor level

A number of slides were then shown which demonstrated the existing layout on site alongside the proposals, and Members were asked to note that there was not a significant increase in the floor areas proposed. First floor level floor plans were shown at this stage. The existing garden centre buildings comprised a range of different materials and styles and appeared somewhat disjointed. They had a low profile with a height of c6.1m. The proposed elevation showed an increase in height in the two storey element of c3m, but due to the lower ground levels at that particular location, the eaves height tied in with the remainder of the garden centre building well.

A number of slides were then shown which detailed the elevation proposed to Cootehall Road and that proposed to Belfast Road. It was noted that the proposal involved reuse and alteration of the existing building alongside extensions and rebuilding of parts. The proposal utilised smooth render with mock Tudor detailing and hardwood windows and doors. Several existing smaller external retail sales buildings associated with the former conservatory business would be retained for reuse in their current form, for display

purposes. It was considered that the proposal introduced a more coherent and articulated built form, with varied roof heights, improves facades, and was considered in line with the SPPS's emphasis on high quality, sustainable design responding to the local context and enhancing visual amenity.

Comprehensive landscaping was proposed which would assist in softening views into the site and integrate the overall site into its setting. Some trees were to be removed from the site of the existing outdoor garden centre and would be replaced on a grassed bank along Cootehall Road side. Alongside the northern and eastern boundaries retention of existing trees with supplementary native planting would reinforce enclosure and provide further screening and encourage biodiversity. More formal, ornamental planting, to include raised planters, specimen trees and mixed shrub and herbaceous bed would provide colour, texture and seasonal interest.

A children's play area was proposed off the terrace area of the restaurant, with two Viking boats which had been used in a number of television and movie productions including Vikings, The Northman, and How to Train Your Dragon. Those would provide an additional attraction in an area which was ideally located adjacent to the restaurant area, enabling parents to avail of refreshments whilst having oversight of play area.

Turning to policy considerations and consultee responses, the officer stated that Members would have read within the Case Officer Report the relevant planning policy context for a retailing location within the countryside. Significant weight was attached to the established lawful use of the site as a garden centre, and it had not been necessary to apply the SPPS's sequential test or retail need assessment as this proposal comprised a reuse and diversification of an existing use which was inherently suited to a rural location. It was not considered to give rise to significant adverse impacts on other town centres. It aligned with the aims of the SPPS and PPS 21 which supported sustainable economic development in the countryside, in the context that it did not represent a new site or extension into the countryside. It was noted the proposal also very much aligned with the Council's Corporate Plan priority of 'increased economic growth attracting more businesses and job'. Furthermore it aligned with the Council's Integrated Regeneration Tourism and Economic Growth Strategy as it would have a particular USP with Ireland which aligned to the Strategy's visitor impact objective of 'raising awareness and standing out'. The proposal would also include a range of creative elements including direct business to Screen Tourism which was identified within the Strategy as a niche market and an audience which was recognised by Tourism NI as continuing to grow.

Additionally, the inclusion of a deli/farm shop indicated increasing the availability of local produce which supported the Council's AND Food and Drink Destination Development Action Plan. The reference to supporting 60 jobs – craftsmen and local producers in the Agri-food category also aligned with the Integrated Strategy's aim to increase jobs in the Borough. The proposal would formalise the parking layout on the site to comprise 147 parking spaces, six disabled spaces and two van spaces. No changes were proposed to the access, and further to having satisfied a request from DFI Roads, statutory

consultee had no objections. The proposal had been assessed against PPS 2 and consultations carried out with NIEA and was considered to have no likely adverse impacts on designated sites, protected or priority species, habitats or features of natural heritage importance. Further to NIW indicating network capacity issues, the proposal was amended to include a septic tank. DFI Rivers had reviewed all submitted information and was content.

In relation to residential amenity, the nearest dwelling was situated in excess of 120m away on Cootehall Road and it was considered there would be no unacceptable impact on their residential amenity in terms of privacy, noise or disturbance. No objections had been submitted in respect of the proposal, whilst 16 letters of support citing various encouragement for the proposal had been received. Subject to the conditions outlined within the Case Officer Report, full planning permission was recommended.

The Chair invited questions to the Officer for clarification and there were no questions at this stage.

The Chair introduced Mr Tom Stokes (Agent) and Mr Justin Lowry (Applicant) who was speaking in support of the application. Mr Stokes address to the Committee was summarised below.

Mr Stokes thanked the Committee for the opportunity to address them adding that also in attendance was Justin Lowry, the applicant and owner of On The Square Emporium. He stated that they would both be happy to answer any questions Members may have.

Acknowledging the Head of Planning's detailed and comprehensive overview of the proposal, they felt it would be good to highlight a few key pertinent points from their side, for this hugely exciting proposal for Bangor. Most Members would be aware that the subject site, formerly occupied by Dickson's Home and Garden Centre, had been largely vacant for over a decade since the garden centre's closure. The overall site, but particularly the main garden centre building had fallen into disrepair in the subsequent years and had resulted in a dilapidated site on the prominent Belfast Road.

The site was purchased by the applicant, Justin Lowry, in 2025. On The Square Emporium was currently located at Horon Road, Belfast and was the largest antique centre on the island of Ireland, providing a range of different services. Those comprised the retail sale of antiques, including online sales to worldwide buyers; commercial fit out and decoration of hotels, bars and museums; and prop hire for film, tv and events. The proposals represented the relocation of the existing Emporium and Justin's vision was to create a joint Antique and Garden Centre, which utilised the existing garden centre use on the site, as well as the provision of a café/restaurant and children's play area. The sale of garden centre products and antiques was complementary and was a model used in a variety of locations in mainland UK. This would be the first antique and garden centre on the island of Ireland. The proposals would build on the existing success of On the Square Emporium, whilst also renovating the existing building and bringing a vacant and underutilised site back into active use. It represented an investment of £5million

from the private sector and would create around 60 jobs once operational in addition to supporting local producers and crafts people. Overall, the proposals reduced the level of retail sales floorspace currently available within the building.

In addition, the existing vacant garden centre presented as an ad hoc collection of structures, with extensions and additions added throughout the years. The proposals would refurbish the existing buildings, and the overall design and materiality had been well considered to provide a cohesive and attractive finish that was appropriate to the location. This would include timber cladding on the parts of the extension visible from the public road and an attractive entrance plaza to the refurbished store. The proposals would formalise the existing unmarked car parking areas. An exciting highlight of the proposal, as identified in the case officer report, would be a children's play area which included two Viking ships that had been used in a number of tv and film productions. Most recently, the ships were used in Christopher Nolan's *The Odyssey*, which was currently in Cinemas.

To conclude, the proposals represented an exciting opportunity for the Ards and North Down Borough for the first Antique and Garden Centre on the island of Ireland, revitalising a vacant and dilapidated garden centre site which had been vacant for over a decade. All consultees had responded offering approval subject to conditions. There had been 16 representations to the application, all of which were letters of support. Subject to planning being granted it was hoped the store would be refurbished and trading by Spring 2027. In summing up Mr Stokes thanked the Planning officers who had processed this application diligently and collaboratively to bring the application before the Committee. He thanked Members for their time and respectfully requested that the Committee endorsed the positive officer recommendation. He added that he and Justin were happy to answer any questions.

The Chair invited questions to the speaker and as there were none, Mr Stokes and Mr Lowry were returned to the public gallery.

Alderman Graham proposed, seconded by Councillor McClean, that the recommendation be adopted and that planning permission be granted.

The proposer Alderman Graham noted that there was no shortage of enthusiasm for this application and in particular he noted there had been no objections and that he believed was due to the way the proposals had been handled from the outset. Alderman Graham agreed that it would align with the Council's plans and rejuvenate the site and he was hopeful that it would be a success.

Commenting as seconder Councillor McClean expressed his thanks to the Planning Team for getting the application through so expeditiously. The applicant had made representation to a number of Members about his proposals and had made comment that he could not fault the Planning Officers in any way for getting the application through so speedily. Continuing Councillor McClean acknowledged that the application would have a turnover of £5M per annum and create up to 65 jobs. It was noted the

application had been delayed by NIEA for over a year and that had nearly caused it to fall through. A third round of questions had been answered by the Applicant in November 2025 and been subsequently advised by the NIEA that they could probably respond by the end of July 2026. That he believed was completely unacceptable and similar delays by other statutory agencies was impacting the ability to build new homes and bring new businesses into the Borough. Continuing Councillor McClean stated that he had been delighted with the feedback which had been received about the Planning Officers who had done their best to get the application through the system.

Councillor Cathcart welcomed the significant vote of confidence shown in Bangor through this investment. He agreed that Planning Officers had been excellent in chasing up the various statutory agencies and this application would demonstrate that the Borough welcomed such schemes and investment. He added that it was really exciting and encouraging to see and he was therefore happy to support.

Rising to also welcome the proposal, Alderman McDowell stated that it was an exciting opportunity to create jobs and growth. The proposal would also see the site tidied up, made more presentable and was an ideal location for such a venture. He was therefore fully supportive of it and looked forward to seeing many more businesses coming to the Ards and North Down Borough.

At this stage the Chairman added that this was a very positive development for the Borough and a proposal which was perfectly aligned to the Council's Corporate Plan. She noted that it also dovetailed with the Council's tourism and agrifood sector ambitions and as such she wished the applicant all the best with his venture.

RESOLVED, on the proposal of Alderman Graham, seconded by Councillor McClean, that the recommendation be adopted and that the Council grants planning permission.

4.3 LA06/2026/0457/F– RETENTION OF OPEN SPACE (TWO YEAR TIME EXTENSION TO TEMPORARY PERMISSION LA06/2024/0182/F) (Appendix III)

PREVIOUSLY CIRCULATED:- Case Officer's report.

DEA: Bangor Central

Committee Interest: – Council Application

Proposal: Retention of open space (Two year time extension to temporary permission LA06/2024/0182/F).

Site Location: Land immediately east of 41 Hamilton Road, South of 1 Springfield Ave (Site of former Hamilton House and Sea Scout Hall), Bangor

Recommendation: Grant Planning Permission

The Head of Planning outlined the Case Officer's Report, explaining that Item 4.3. was for the Retention of Open Space for a further Two -year Time Extension to a Temporary Permission issued under LA06/2024/0182/F.

Members would recall the previous application brought before the Committee in July 2024 and this Application was before them as it was a Council application

The site occupied a triangular plot of land opposite the junction of Hamilton Road and Park Avenue. Ward Park lay to the south east on the opposite side of the road, whilst Springfield Avenue, which housed several private residential properties ran parallel to the rear of the site. The site was situated within the proposed Bangor Central Area of Townscape Character (ATC).

The continuation of the site for temporary use as an area of open space, was acceptable in context of the surrounding area which was a suitable 'mean-while' use until such time as an appropriate replacement proposal was submitted.

Members may be aware that the site was for sale and a conditional offer was accepted, subject to attaining planning permission, and that the Council was dealing with the purchaser's solicitors accordingly. The Contract became binding on 5 December 2025, and the purchaser had 18 months from that date to obtain satisfactory planning permission. There was no specified date as to when they needed to have submitted plans, however there was a longstop date of 18 months for them to make the application and get approval. They also did have to use all reasonable endeavours to obtain Planning Permission as soon as possible.

A Grant of permission for a temporary period of two years was recommended.

The Chair invited questions to the Officer.

Councillor Cathcart recalled that Planning Permission had been granted to knock the buildings down given the bad repair they were in. As such he asked what the consequences would be if the Planning Permission lapsed.

In response the Head of Planning stated that was a difficult situation originally as the Policy required you to have a replacement scheme, however due to the anti-social behaviour which had been taking place on the site along with the presence of asbestos it was considered at that time to relax that requirement, albeit only on a temporary basis. She emphasised that this was not branding the area as Open Space adding that officers were awaiting receipt of the replacement scheme. By seeking the Consent Members were advised that it kept the matter in line to help ensure Planning did not elapse.

In response Councillor Cathcart asked for clarification around NIW connections to the site in relation to the sale.

The Head of Planning indicated that she was not keen to stray into the land transaction territory but suggested that any proposal submitted may be subject to whatever those conditions were, and consultation would have to be carried out accordingly.

Following on Councillor Hennessy noted this was the fourth extension in two years and asked if that could continue indefinitely.

The Head of Planning advised that the site needed to be safeguarded as essentially it remained a brownfield site within a settlement and town centre. She added that it was hoped it would not continue indefinitely.

At this stage the Chairman commented that the site had previously been on the market and had failed to find a buyer.

Councillor Cathcart proposed, seconded by Councillor McClean, that the recommendation be adopted and that Council grants planning permission.

RESOLVED, on the proposal of Councillor Cathcart, seconded by Councillor McClean, that the recommendation be adopted and that Council grants planning permission.

4.4 LA06/2026/0323/A– ERECTION OF 2 SIGNS - SPONSORSHIP SIGNAGE (Appendix IV)

PREVIOUSLY CIRCULATED:- Case Officer's report.

DEA: Holywood & Clandeboye

Committee Interest: – Council Application

Proposal: Erection of 2 Signs - Sponsorship Signage

Site Location: Roadside verge between Croft Road and Bangor Road, Holywood (retrospective)

Recommendation: Grant Consent

The Head of Planning presented the Report explaining that Item 4.4.sought consent for the erection of 2 signs – Sponsorship Signage on the roadside verge between Croft Road and Bangor Road, Holywood. It was retrospective as the signs had been erected under the Parks' Department's roundabout sponsorship policy but required advertising consent.

It was noted that no representations had been received and it was recommended that Advertising Consent be granted with a condition attached that they were maintained in a clean and tidy condition. It was therefore recommended that Advertising Consent was granted.

The Chair invited questions to the Officer for clarification and no questions were raised.

RESOLVED, on the proposal of Councillor Wray, seconded by Councillor Hennessy, that the recommendation be adopted and that the Council grants consent.

5. PROPOSED CHARGES FOR BUILDING CONTROL AND PLANNING SERVICE

(Appendix V)

PREVIOUSLY CIRCULATED:- Report from the Director of Place and Prosperity detailing that the Council's Building Control Service held drawings and information relating to the construction of buildings and alterations dating back to 1973 in the legacy North Down Borough area, and to 1995 in the legacy Ards Borough area. Hard copy files were retained and information had to be physically obtained, sorted, redacted and where appropriate, reproduced and released. While this information was sought after by people for a number of reasons, Building Control files were not public domain information, and release was controlled in line with guidance. The location and consideration as to whether information could be released took up an increasing amount of the Service's resources.

Key Issues

Since the introduction of the Freedom of Information Act (FOI), requests to Building Control had increased in number and complexity over the years, with associated staff time and costs. Whilst FOI requests were still dealt with under that legislation, the including of the provision of such information on the Council's list of publications allowed Council to charge appropriate costs for this service.

The provision of Local Government Property Certificates was included within this register of charges; however, the fee had been established across the 11 Councils and in agreement with the Law Society. There was an agreement for a three yearly inflationary cost review, most recently updated in April 2026. Charges would be reviewed yearly for April amendment in line with Council's charging policy.

In relation to Planning Service, charges for copy documents/history searches had not been increased since c2018. It was proposed to apply an appropriate increase to reflect resource requirements.

Next Steps

Should Council approve this proposal, the next steps would be to publish the charging schedule, giving notice of its introduction (one month).

Once the notice period expired, the charging schedule would be applied to all the requests for the noted information.

Summary

The introduction of the proposed non statutory charges would cover the costs of the staff resource currently committed to this service.

RECOMMENDED that Council approves the attached building control and planning services.

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

6. RTPI NI POLITICIANS IN PLANNING EVENT (Appendix VI)

PREVIOUSLY CIRCULATED:- Report from the Director of Place and Prosperity stating that the Head of Planning and Building Control had received the attached notification of an event to be hosted by the Royal Town Planning Institute (RTPI) as part of its Politicians in Planning theme.

The event, to be held on 15 October, 10:00 -14:00, at Burnavon Arts Centre, Cookstown, would focus on Shaping better Places and was aimed at elected members and those involved in Planning Committees. The programme was designed to explore the issues that mattered to elected members, support informed decision-making and strengthen confidence in the planning process.

Each Council had been allocated eight complimentary places for elected members and those involved in Planning Committees. Further places would be limited but could be booked for a £20 (plus vat) fee. Booking closed on Friday 9 October 2026.

RECOMMENDED that Council agrees to nominate elected members to attend and the Head of Planning and Building Control will book accordingly.

Councillor Hennessy proposed, seconded by Councillor Morgan, that the recommendation be adopted.

At this stage nominations were sought for Members to attend the event and the following nominations were made.

Councillor Morgan – Proposed by Councillor Hennessy and seconded by Alderman Graham.

Councillor McCollum – Proposed by Alderman Graham, seconded by Councillor McClean.

AGREED TO RECOMMEND, on the proposal of Councillor Hennessy, seconded by Councillor Morgan, that the recommendation be adopted and furthermore that Councillors Morgan and McCollum be nominated to attend.

7. UPDATE ON PLANNING APPEALS

PREVIOUSLY CIRCULATED:- Report from the Director of Place and Prosperity detailing that in respect of Appeal Decisions, there were no decisions since date of last report.

New Appeals

1. The following appeal was lodged on 23 June 2026:

PAC Ref	2026/A0033
Council Ref	LA06/2024/0882/O
Appellant	Angus Alan
Subject of Appeal	Dwelling on a farm
Location	Land approx.. 65m south-east of 1 Dunover Road, Ballywalter

2. The following appeal was lodged on 17 June 2026:

PAC Ref	2026/E0027
Council Ref	LA06/2025/0141/CA
Appellant	Matthew McAree
Subject of Appeal	Alleged unauthorised cabin for residential and storage use
Location	Land at land approx. 40m SE of No.4 Cunningburn Road, Newtownards

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

RECOMMENDED that Council notes this report.

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

8. FOLLOW UP FROM DFI MINISTER POST MEETING RE NIW

(Appendix VII)

PREVIOUSLY CIRCULATED:- Report from the Director of Place and Prosperity detailing that at the Planning Committee meeting of 3 March 2026, the Head of Planning brought Item 5 on NIW Closed Catchments. Further to discussion it was determined to request for a cross-party delegation to meet with the DFI Minister. The Chief Executive and Head of Planning accompanied Aldermen McDowell and McIlveen and Councillors Brady and Smart to that meeting which was held on 15 June at Parliament Buildings.

There was detailed discussion held, and it was proposed to follow up with further correspondence seeking clarification on some matters – see Chief Executive's letter dated 18 June attached.

The Minister's response to those points of clarification was attached for Members' attention.

Further to this letter being received, the Head of Planning had opportunity to attend an event held in Parliament Buildings on 1 July 2026, held by the Wastewater Infrastructure Group and entitled: 'The Cost of Doing Nothing', at which a report entitled 'Wastewater Constraints and the cost of delay in Northern Ireland – an economy with the brakes on' was launched. A copy of the report was attached for Members' information, and highlighted that there could be a resultant economic opportunity gap of £10.bn in NI by 2040 if the current wastewater infrastructure deficit continued to constrain capital expenditure.

RECOMMENDED that Council notes this report and the attached letters and report.

Councillor Smart proposed an amendment, seconded by Alderman McIlveen, that the Council writes back to the Minister to object to the lack of inclusion in infrastructural investment in the 2028-33 price control period. To ask the Minister to review what opportunity exists to consider planning permissions that have been granted, but not built, and the variance between Councils in how these are considered. And furthermore to seek confirmation that the Minister will give priority to infrastructure investment to protect the future viability of our town and urban centres.

The proposer Councillor Smart commented that everyone would be aware of the meeting which had taken place which Members had welcomed, however the response received from the Minister was in his opinion deplorable. The lack of wastewater investment was impacting both the construction of new homes and bringing derelict properties back into use and could see over 6,000 new homes not built. He also noted within the Minister's response that the South Street Wastewater Pumping station was unlikely to be upgraded and that he believed was unacceptable. Councillor Smart added that the Minister had not responded to any of the points which had been raised with her and as such he was seeking Members' support for his amendment.

Commenting as seconder, Alderman McIlveen stated that he was happy to support the amendment, adding that he too was very disappointed with the Minister's response. Indeed he believed at the meeting the Minister was more interested in blame and developer levies which she appeared to believe were the best way forward. In respect of the South Street Wastewater Pumping station, he was aware that there were spillages which were constantly happening with 50million litres of wastewater going into the Ards Canal on its way to Strangford Lough. Something which the Minister seemed to be content with. NIW could do some works to lessen those spillages by requesting permission from NIEA however in his opinion the Minister was in denial that it was her responsibility to get such issues resolved. Alderman McIlveen expressed his

disappointment with the response received from the Minister agreeing that she had not taken on board all of the points which had been put to her. The issues now being faced had been on the horizon for decades, compounded further by the Environment Minister who wished to withdraw SORPI which would see 80% of planning applications cease and that was not acceptable. As such Alderman McIlveen believed that a joined-up approach needed to be adopted by the Executive in tandem with the Infrastructure Minister.

Also expressing her disappointment, Alderman McAlpine noted that the contents of the Turley Report were frightening. As such she asked if a joined-up approach to tackle the matter could be undertaken by all 11 Councils in Northern Ireland given that it was stifling all forms of development currently.

At this stage the Chairman commented that she too had attended the meeting with the Minister and confirmed that all 11 Councils had been represented.

Also commenting the Director advised that SOLACE had discussed the matter and written a letter to the Minister on behalf of the Chief Executives. However it was further noted that the response received had been similar to that received by the Council.

Concurring with the comments already made, Councillor Cathcart expressed his disappointment with the comments around the South Street Wastewater Pumping station as one of the Council's key goals was to regenerate town centres. He stated that he had found it all to be in complete contrast with the Minister's photo shoot which had taken place the previous year in Newry to announce a £26M investment in wastewater infrastructure, which was her constituency. This notably was not taking place elsewhere. He asked what the Council could do given that the Minister's department had one of the largest Executive budgets.

In response the Head of Planning advised that SuDS had long been an issue as the outcome of consultation was still being awaited. It was noted that Working Groups had been established which Building Control offices along with Planning Officers were members of. She also noted that NIW was keen for developers to buy into Wastewater Impact Assessments prior to submitting planning applications. A process which could take up to 24 months. Continuing she also acknowledged the ongoing issues with negatively conditioning when solutions were unknown in respect of engineering matters and the potential impact on drainage systems. As such the Head of Planning believed the Council could not currently do anything. Members were advised that NIEA had introduced Performance Improvement Plans and managed to clear a considerable backlog and were now responding much quicker. Given the success of this, officers would be keen to see other statutory agencies undertake similar Performance Improvement Plans. Having said that she acknowledged that NIW officers were doing their best to find solutions while their hands were also tied. She indicated that she was unsure of the way forward and it would ultimately get to the stage where you could not flush your toilet or officers be able to approve any planning applications.

Alderman McDowell indicated that he too had been at the meeting held with the Minister and had found it thoroughly depressing. He believed there would be serious consequences in the future and as such he fully supported the proposal. Continuing he suggested that perhaps the Council needed to consider how it could help itself given that any potential solutions could take years to put into place. This was in his opinion one of the most serious crises being faced by the Council and the biggest issue undoubtedly was funding. He added that people would notice a difference shortly if the matter was not resolved.

Alderman Smith indicated that he wished to add his voice to the depressive discussion and referring to the Turley report and its forecast that by 2040 the economic impact of doing no more would be £10.9bn. Looking at the figures in the report he noted that while Ards and North Down was not the worst affected, by 2040 it would be affecting the economy in the Borough to the tune of hundreds of millions of pounds. While he had not been in attendance at the most recent meeting he had been in attendance at a previous meeting held at Kinnegar. The letter received and its tone was disappointing overall and it seemed to be the case that her solution was to go back to the Executive for further funding. The same Executive he noted which had failed to set a budget. He stated that what she was proposing would not meet what was required hence his support for the amended proposal.

Councillor McCollum commented that she had also attended the meeting held at Kinnegar and nothing had changed since then. Blame was apportioned to the British Government for not providing appropriate funding and everyone agreed that sticking-plaster solutions would not remedy decades of under investment in this infrastructure. She added that it was particularly frustrating as the Council's hands were effectively tied but acknowledged that the cross party approach which had been adopted was the best way forward.

In summing up Councillor Smart agreed that it was helpful the Council was speaking with one voice to take the matter forwards. One positive was that for those who did not enjoy Planning Committee there may no longer be a need for it if people were unable to build houses as a result of this. He added that any action which could be taken needed to be taken to try to move the matter forward.

AGREED TO RECOMMEND, on the proposal of Councillor Smart, seconded by Alderman McIlveen, that the Council writes back to the Minister to object to the lack of inclusion in infrastructural investment in the 2028-33 price control period. To ask the Minister to review what opportunity exists to consider planning permissions that have been granted, but not built, and the variance between Councils in how these are considered. And furthermore to seek confirmation that the Minister will give priority to infrastructure investment to protect the future viability of our town and urban centres.

EXCLUSION OF PUBLIC/PRESS

AGREED, on the proposal of Alderman McIlveen, seconded by Councillor Smart, that the public/press be excluded during the discussion of the undernoted item of confidential business.

9. ADVANCE NOTICE OF LISTING (Appendix VIII)

****IN CONFIDENCE****

Exemption Reason:

6a. Exemption: statutory provision

SUMMARY

This report was presented in confidence to Members under Part 1 of Schedule 6 of the Local Government (Northern Ireland) Act 2014, Exemption 6a – Information which reveals that the Council proposes to give under any statutory provision a notice by virtue of which requirements are imposed on a person.

RE-ADMITTANCE OF PUBLIC/PRESS

AGREED, on the proposal of Alderman McIlveen, seconded by Councillor Wray, that the public/press be re-admitted to the meeting.

TERMINATION OF MEETING

The meeting terminated at 9.00pm.

Deputation Request Form

A 'deputation request' refers to a person or group of persons asking to appear in person before the Council or a Council Committee in order to address the Council or Committee (as the case may be) on a particular matter.

The procedure governing deputations is contained within section 12 of the Council's Standing Orders, a copy of which is set out below.

If you wish to make a deputation request, please complete this form and return it to Ards and North Down Borough Council via the following email address: member.services@ardsandnorthdown.gov.uk, providing us with a contact email or postal address and contact telephone number when doing so (please do not include your personal contact details on this form – see privacy notice below).

Please note that it will be for the Council to decide whether to accede to your request and, if it does, to determine when and where the deputation will be heard. The Council will draw upon the information you provide in this form in order to reach its decision, therefore you are encouraged to clearly outline the topic of your request and the reason why you wish to raise the matter before the Council or a Committee.

Applicant Details

We apply to Ards and North Down Borough Council to make a deputation and should this application be successful, I/we agree to comply with section 12 of the Council's Standing Orders.

Name of person(s) making the deputation request:	Iain Greenway
Date of request:	1 August 2026
If making the deputation on behalf of an organisation or a group of individuals, name of the organisation / individuals:	Northern Community Leisure Trust
Name of Committee (if known) to which you wish to make your deputation:	Active & Healthy Communities

Please summarise below (continuing onto an additional page if required) the subject matter of your deputation request and the reason why you wish to raise the matter before the Council or a Committee.

The Trust provides leisure services in North Down, under contract to the Council (in particular at Bangor Aurora, Queen’s Leisure Centre, and Bangor Sportsplex). We have completed an annual report of our achievements and progress in 2025/26, and wish to provide the Committee with a presentation on this progress, and the opportunities to build on it by continuing collaboration across the Borough between outsourced and in-house service provision, in line with the intent of the September 2026 Council Motion and decision.

There is a paper on Trust progress to the Committee quarterly, but this is generally taken late in the agenda without substantive discussion; but the services provided by the Trust are a vital and substantial part of the activity to deliver the Council’s Leisure Strategy, so we seek opportunity to enable a more substantive Committee discussion.

Extract from Ards and North Down Borough Council's Standing Orders, Version 12, January 2025

12. Deputations

(1) Deputations, from any source, shall only be admitted to address the Council provided the Chief Executive has received seven working days notice of the intended deputation and a statement of its objective, and subject to the agreement of the Council.

(2) In the case of an emergency, deputations, from any source, shall only be admitted to address the Council provided the Chief Executive has received one working day's notice of the intended deputation and a statement of its objective, and subject to the agreement of the Mayor.

(3) The deputation shall be confined to the presentation of a statement, or copy of resolutions, and shall not make more than two short addresses by any two members of the deputation. The totality of the address shall not exceed 10 minutes followed by a maximum 15 minutes question and answer session.

(4) Deputations should not be repetitive and, where possible, issues of a similar or linked nature should be contained in one deputation. Where a deputation has made a presentation to the Council, the Council will decline to accept another deputation on the same issue from the same individual or group for a period of six months.

(5) No further discussion or proposals beyond questions shall take place at a Council or Committee meeting until after the deputation has withdrawn (members of the deputation will remain subject to Standing Order 8). Any subsequent proposal made should be limited to a request for officers to bring back a report on the matters raised by the deputation.

Privacy notice – how we will use information about you

Ards and North Down Borough Council is a Data Processor under the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) for the personal data it gathers when receiving and administering deputation requests.

You are providing your personal data to the Council whose lawful basis for processing it falls within the following three categories:

- a) **Consent** - you consent to the information being processed for the specific purpose of the Council considering your deputation request;
- b) **Public task** - the processing is necessary in order for the Council to consider your request in line with its Standing Orders which were established under the Local Government Act (Northern Ireland) 2014; and
- c) **Legitimate interests** - the processing is necessary for your legitimate interests (or the legitimate interests of a third party) in order that Council may consider your deputation request.

The personal data you provide when making a deputation request may be shared internally within the Council with staff who are involved in decision making and administration in respect of Council and Committee meetings. This includes both the data contained within this form and any other data, such as an email address or other contact details, we may gather when you send the form to us.

The information you provide on this form only will be provided as a report to Council and potentially thereafter as a report to a Committee (depending on whether Council accedes to your request). Any such report will not usually be heard 'in confidence' and therefore the report will also be published on the Council website prior to the meeting. Members of the press and public may attend the Council (and Committee) meeting at which the report is discussed. An audio recording and written minute will be made of the meeting and both will be published on the website.

Your personal data will not be shared or disclosed to any other organisation without your consent, unless the law permits or places an obligation on the Council to do so.

Personal data is held and stored by the Council in a safe and secure manner and in compliance with Data Protection legislation and in line with the Council's Records Retention and Disposal Schedule.

If you have any queries regarding the processing of your personal data, please contact:

Data Protection Officer
Ards and North Down Borough Council
City Hall, The Castle
Bangor
BT20 4BT
Email: dataprotection@ardsandnorthdown.gov.uk
Tel: 0300 013 3333

Unclassified

ITEM 8.1.

Ards and North Down Borough Council

Report Classification	Unclassified
Exemption Reason	Not Applicable
	If multiple:
Meeting	Council
Date of Meeting	26 August 2026
Responsible Director	Chief Executive
Responsible Head of Service	
Report title	Deputation Request from Northern Community Leisure Trust
Attachments	Appendix 1 - Deputation Request Form
File Reference (if applicable)	
Legislation	Local Government Act (Northern Ireland) 2014
Resource Implications	None
	Narrative:
Screening Requirements	<i>The Council will commit to consider the implication of all reports under the categories of Section 75, Rural Needs, Data Protection, Climate and Sustainability:</i> Screening of report not required
Link to Corporate Plan Priority and Outcome	Priority 3: Social Multiple If multiple:

Background

A deputation request has been received from Iain Greenway on behalf of Northern Community Leisure Trust.

The attached request form states that Northern Community Leisure Trust wish to make the deputation to the Active & Healthy Communities Committee regarding its annual report of achievements and progress in 2025/26.

The deputation request form is attached at Appendix 1.

RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that Council Considers the deputation request.

Deputation Request Form

A 'deputation request' refers to a person or group of persons asking to appear in person before the Council or a Council Committee in order to address the Council or Committee (as the case may be) on a particular matter.

The procedure governing deputations is contained within section 12 of the Council's Standing Orders, a copy of which is set out below.

If you wish to make a deputation request, please complete this form and return it to Ards and North Down Borough Council via the following email address: member.services@ardsandnorthdown.gov.uk, providing us with a contact email or postal address and contact telephone number when doing so (please do not include your personal contact details on this form – see privacy notice below).

Please note that it will be for the Council to decide whether to accede to your request and, if it does, to determine when and where the deputation will be heard. The Council will draw upon the information you provide in this form in order to reach its decision, therefore you are encouraged to clearly outline the topic of your request and the reason why you wish to raise the matter before the Council or a Committee.

Applicant Details

I/we apply to Ards and North Down Borough Council to make a deputation and should this application be successful, I/we agree to comply with section 12 of the Council's Standing Orders.

Name of person(s) making the deputation request:	Mo Aswat & Noelle McAloon
Date of request:	07 August 2026
If making the deputation on behalf of an organisation or a group of individuals, name of the organisation / individuals:	Bangor Business Improvement District Steering Group
Name of Committee (if known) to which you wish to make your deputation:	Place & Prosperity Committee on 08 October 2026

Please summarise below (continuing onto an additional page if required) the subject matter of your deputation request and the reason why you wish to raise the matter before the Council or a Committee.

Mo Aswat is Director of The Mosaic Partnership, who have developed over 150 BIDs in the UK and all 8 in Northern Ireland. We have been commissioned by the Bangor BID Steering Group to advise on the development of the BID. Noelle McAloon is the Manager of the Enniskillen BID, one of the earliest and most successful BIDs in NI, established in 2017 and renewed again by businesses in 2022

The development of a BID in any location is an intensive and involved process involving many parties. The intention is to brief Councillors first hand, on the development of the Bangor Business Improvement District including the project timetable and work. The level of business engagement, the role of the Council, both statutory and discretionary, and to show the potential benefits of the BID, through the experience of Enniskillen.

It will also provide an opportunity for Councillors to question the organisers and raise any issues that they might have.

Extract from Ards and North Down Borough Council's Standing Orders, Version 11, April 2024

12. Deputations

(1) Deputations, from any source, shall only be admitted to address the Council provided the Chief Executive has received seven working days notice of the intended deputation and a statement of its objective, and subject to the agreement of the Council.

(2) In the case of an emergency, deputations, from any source, shall only be admitted to address the Council provided the Chief Executive has received one working day's notice of the intended deputation and a statement of its objective, and subject to the agreement of the Mayor.

(3) The deputation shall be confined to the presentation of a statement, or copy of resolutions, and shall not make more than two short addresses by any two members of the deputation. The totality of the address shall not exceed 10 minutes followed by a maximum 15 minutes question and answer session.

(4) Deputations should not be repetitive and, where possible, issues of a similar or linked nature should be contained in one deputation. Where a deputation has made a presentation to the Council, the Council will decline to accept another deputation on the same issue from the same individual or group for a period of six months.

(5) No further discussion or proposals beyond questions shall take place at a Council or Committee meeting until after the deputation has withdrawn. Any subsequent proposal made should be limited to a request for officers to bring back a report on the matters raised by the deputation.

Privacy notice – how we will use information about you

Ards and North Down Borough Council is a Data Processor under the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) for the personal data it gathers when receiving and administering deputation requests.

You are providing your personal data to the Council whose lawful basis for processing it falls within the following three categories:

- a) **Consent** - you consent to the information being processed for the specific purpose of the Council considering your deputation request;
- b) **Public task** - the processing is necessary in order for the Council to consider your request in line with its Standing Orders which were established under the Local Government Act (Northern Ireland) 2014; and
- c) **Legitimate interests** - the processing is necessary for your legitimate interests (or the legitimate interests of a third party) in order that Council may consider your deputation request.

The personal data you provide when making a deputation request may be shared internally within the Council with staff who are involved in decision making and administration in respect of Council and Committee meetings. This includes both the data contained within this form and any other data, such as an email address or other contact details, we may gather when you send the form to us.

The information you provide on this form only will be provided as a report to Council and potentially thereafter as a report to a Committee (depending on whether Council accedes to your request). Any such report will not usually be heard 'in confidence' and therefore the report will also be published on the Council website prior to the meeting. Members of the press and public may attend the Council (and Committee) meeting at which the report is discussed. An audio recording and written minute will be made of the meeting and both will be published on the website.

Your personal data will not be shared or disclosed to any other organisation without your consent, unless the law permits or places an obligation on the Council to do so.

Personal data is held and stored by the Council in a safe and secure manner and in compliance with Data Protection legislation and in line with the Council's Records Retention and Disposal Schedule.

If you have any queries regarding the processing of your personal data, please contact:

Data Protection Officer
Ards and North Down Borough Council
Town Hall, The Castle
Bangor
BT20 4BT
Email: dataprotection@ardsandnorthdown.gov.uk
Tel: 0300 013 3333

Unclassified

ITEM 8.2.

Ards and North Down Borough Council

Report Classification	Unclassified
Exemption Reason	Not Applicable
	If multiple:
Meeting	Council
Date of Meeting	26 August 2026
Responsible Director	Chief Executive
Responsible Head of Service	
Report title	Deputation Request from Mo Aswat & Noelle McAloon
Attachments	Appendix 1 - Deputation Request Form
File Reference (if applicable)	
Legislation	Local Government Act (Northern Ireland) 2014
Resource Implications	None
	Narrative:
Screening Requirements	<i>The Council will commit to consider the implication of all reports under the categories of Section 75, Rural Needs, Data Protection, Climate and Sustainability:</i> Screening of report not required
Link to Corporate Plan Priority and Outcome	Priority 1: Economic Multiple If multiple:

Background

A deputation request has been received from Mo Awat & Noelle McAloon on behalf of Bangor Business Improvement District Steering Group.

The attached request form states that they had been commissioned by the Bangor BID Steering Group to make the deputation to the relevant committee regarding the development of a Business Improvement District (BID) for Bangor.

The deputation request form is attached at Appendix 1.

RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that Council Considers the deputation request.



Deputation Request Form

A 'deputation request' refers to a person or group of persons asking to appear in person before the Council or a Council Committee in order to address the Council or Committee (as the case may be) on a particular matter.

The procedure governing deputations is contained within section 12 of the Council's Standing Orders, a copy of which is set out below.

If you wish to make a deputation request, please complete this form and return it to Ards and North Down Borough Council via the following email address: member.services@ardsandnorthdown.gov.uk, providing us with a contact email or postal address and contact telephone number when doing so (please do not include your personal contact details on this form – see privacy notice below).

Please note that it will be for the Council to decide whether to accede to your request and, if it does, to determine when and where the deputation will be heard. The Council will draw upon the information you provide in this form in order to reach its decision, therefore you are encouraged to clearly outline the topic of your request and the reason why you wish to raise the matter before the Council or a Committee.

Applicant Details

We apply to Ards and North Down Borough Council to make a deputation and should this application be successful, I/we agree to comply with section 12 of the Council's Standing Orders.

Name of person(s) making the deputation request:	Mr Suneil Sharma
Date of request:	Wednesday 29 th July 2026
If making the deputation on behalf of an organisation or a group of individuals, name of the organisation/individuals:	Regional Asset Management Strategy Limited
Name of Committee (if known) to which you wish to make your deputation:	Full Council

Please summarise below (continuing onto an additional page if required) the subject matter of your deputation request and the reason why you wish to raise the matter before the Council or a Committee.

Proposal for the acquisition and redevelopment of the derelict Flagship Shopping Centre.

The joint acquisition of the derelict Flagship Shopping Centre by Ards and North Down Council and Regional Asset Management Strategy Limited to regenerate Bangor City Centre by relocating council offices onto a redeveloped Flagship site. This redevelopment would create a unique civic space totalling 118,000 sq ft of new office accommodation, 85,000 sq ft of which will be new state-of-the-art council offices, 33,000 sq ft for other civic uses, plus an additional 10,000 sq ft of retail for a specific operator. The total scale of the redeveloped site would be circa 130,000 sq ft with an investment of £40 million.

The development phase of the new council offices could be another joint venture, with the council receiving a share of the development profit upon sale of the Council offices to the Department of Finance. The Council will, in addition, be able to generate significant new revenue streams through its partnership with RAMS Ltd.

This proposal will be a transformational development which can be delivered within a timescale that can bring some momentum to the regeneration of Bangor City Centre. In addition, working in partnership with RAMS Ltd gives the Council not just control over the process but a say in the outcome. Finally, I would like this proposal to be heard by the full Council because the subject matter is significant and relevant to more than one of the Council's Committees.



Extract from Ards and North Down Borough Council's Standing Orders, Version 12, January 2025

12. Deputations

(1) Deputations, from any source, shall only be admitted to address the Council provided the Chief Executive has received seven working days notice of the intended deputation and a statement of its objective, and subject to the agreement of the Council.

(2) In the case of an emergency, deputations, from any source, shall only be admitted to address the Council provided the Chief Executive has received one working day's notice of the intended deputation and a statement of its objective, and subject to the agreement of the Mayor.

(3) The deputation shall be confined to the presentation of a statement, or copy of resolutions, and shall not make more than two short addresses by any two members of the deputation. The totality of the address shall not exceed 10 minutes followed by a maximum 15 minutes question and answer session.

(4) Deputations should not be repetitive and, where possible, issues of a similar or linked nature should be contained in one deputation. Where a deputation has made a presentation to the Council, the Council will decline to accept another deputation on the same issue from the same individual or group for a period of six months.

(5) No further discussion or proposals beyond questions shall take place at a Council or Committee meeting until after the deputation has withdrawn (members of the deputation will remain subject to Standing Order 8). Any subsequent proposal made should be limited to a request for officers to bring back a report on the matters raised by the deputation.

Privacy notice – how we will use information about you

Ards and North Down Borough Council is a Data Processor under the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) for the personal data it gathers when receiving and administering deputation requests.

You are providing your personal data to the Council whose lawful basis for processing it falls within the following three categories:

- a) **Consent** - you consent to the information being processed for the specific purpose of the Council considering your deputation request;
- b) **Public task** - the processing is necessary in order for the Council to consider your request in line with its Standing Orders which were established under the Local Government Act (Northern Ireland) 2014; and
- c) **Legitimate interests** - the processing is necessary for your legitimate interests (or the legitimate interests of a third party) in order that Council may consider your deputation request.

The personal data you provide when making a deputation request may be shared internally within the Council with staff who are involved in decision making and administration in respect of Council and Committee meetings. This includes both the data contained within this form and any other data, such as an email address or other contact details, we may gather when you send the form to us.

The information you provide on this form only will be provided as a report to Council and potentially thereafter as a report to a Committee (depending on whether Council accedes to your request). Any such report will not usually be heard 'in confidence' and therefore the report will also be published on the Council website prior to the meeting. Members of the press and public may attend the Council (and Committee) meeting at which the report is discussed. An audio recording and written minute will be made of the meeting and both will be published on the website.

Your personal data will not be shared or disclosed to any other organisation without your consent, unless the law permits or places an obligation on the Council to do so.

Personal data is held and stored by the Council in a safe and secure manner and in compliance with Data Protection legislation and in line with the Council's Records Retention and Disposal Schedule.

If you have any queries regarding the processing of your personal data, please contact:

Data Protection Officer
Ards and North Down Borough Council
City Hall, The Castle
Bangor
BT20 4BT
Email: dataprotection@ardsandnorthdown.gov.uk
Tel: 0300 013 3333

Unclassified

ITEM 8.3

Ards and North Down Borough Council

Report Classification	Unclassified
Exemption Reason	Not Applicable
	If multiple:
Meeting	Council
Date of Meeting	26 August 2026
Responsible Director	Chief Executive
Responsible Head of Service	
Report title	Deputation Request - Regional Asset Management Strategy Limited
Attachments	Appendix 1 - Deputation Request form
File Reference (if applicable)	
Legislation	Local Government Act (Northern Ireland) 2014
Resource Implications	None Narrative:
Screening Requirements	<i>The Council will commit to consider the implication of all reports under the categories of Section 75, Rural Needs, Data Protection, Climate and Sustainability:</i> Screening of report not required
Link to Corporate Plan Priority and Outcome	Priority 3: Social 7. Ards and North Down Borough Council is a high performing organisation If multiple:

Background

A request has come from Mr Suneil Sharma at the Regional Asset Management Strategy Limited requesting a deputation to be heard at full Council, see enclosed.

Mr Sharma has also communicated to officers that he wishes, should the request be accepted, that it is heard in confidence.

The request is regarding a proposal for a joint requisition of the Flagship Shopping Centre between the Council and Regional Asset Management Strategy Limited and to relocate the council offices onto a redeveloped Flagship site.

Key Considerations

Members will be aware that Council approved of an Outline Business Case (OBC) for the rationalisation of the Council's civic/office accommodation options to better meet the post RPA needs of the Council and offer better value for money to the ratepayer and regeneration opportunities for the Borough.

Following the approval of the OBC a site selection and scoring exercise was undertaken to establish the availability/suitability of sites and options for a lease /purchase and a refurbish/new build Civic Headquarters, located within either Bangor City Centre or Newtownards Town Centre boundaries. This process resulted in Council agreeing to take forward two sites in Bangor City centre for further consideration, these being the Queen's Parade site or the former Flagship Centre.

Based on an analysis of both site options, Council approved in August 2025 to progress with the Queens Parade site as the preferred option, with new headquarters to be located on Main Street. Discussions with the developer, and the Department for Finance (DoF) as a potential partner who would bring c400 Department for Education employees along with Council's c400 employees into the city centre, are progressing in this regard.

Members will also be aware of the need to follow DoF guidance to Local Authorities in Northern Ireland to ensure best value is achieved in either the purchase or sale of land/assets and that an OBC would be required for any site purchase. Members will further be aware of their legal obligations under the Procurement Act, in terms of partnering with a commercial developer/company. Direct negotiations with any party without the prior advertisement of the potential opportunity is contrary to the general procurement principle of transparency and raises questions as to the ability to achieve and demonstrate value for money.

Next Steps

Council to consider the request for a Deputation to be heard at full Council in September, in confidence.

RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that Council **Considers** this request.

Tobacco and vapes: packaging, appearance and display – Consultation Response

About you

Questions for everyone

In what capacity are you responding to this survey?

- An individual sharing my personal views and experiences
- An individual sharing my professional views
- **On behalf of an organisation**

Do you have any direct or indirect links to, or receive funding from, the tobacco industry?

- Yes
- **No**

Questions for people responding on behalf of an organisation

What is the size of your organisation? (Optional)

- Small (0 to 49 employees)
- Medium (50 to 249 employees)
- **Large (250 or more employees)**

Where does your organisation operate or provide services? Select all that apply. (Optional)

- England
- Wales
- Scotland
- **Northern Ireland**
- The whole of the UK
- Outside the UK

Please provide the name of the organisation you are responding on behalf of. (Optional)

Ards and North Down Borough Council

Questions for people sharing their professional views and those responding on behalf of an organisation

What is the main area or focus of your work? (Optional)

- Academic
- Advocacy
- Distribution

- Education
- Emergency services
- Enforcement agencies
- Healthcare
- Hospitality
- Justice system
- Legal
- **Local government**
- National government
- Production or manufacturing
- Retail
- Social care
- Wholesale
- Other, please specify

Do you work for, or are you providing views on behalf of, any of the following? Select all that apply.

- Manufacturer or producer of a tobacco product
- Manufacturer or producer of a vape or nicotine product
- Importer of a tobacco product
- Importer of a vape or nicotine product
- Distributor of a tobacco product
- Distributor of a vape or nicotine product
- Retailer of a tobacco product
- Retailer of a vape or nicotine product

Or:

- **None of the above**

Tobacco packaging

1. Proposals for further plain packaging requirements

We propose to introduce plain packaging requirements for:

- all tobacco products (including but not limited to cigars, cigarillos, pipe tobacco, waterpipe tobacco, smokeless and heated tobacco)

- heated tobacco devices
- herbal smoking products
- cigarette papers

These requirements would broadly align with existing requirements for cigarettes and hand-rolling tobacco.

An overview of the existing requirements for cigarettes and hand-rolling tobacco is set out below.

Colour

Pantone 448C (drab dark brown) colour with a matt finish.

Branding

Brand name permitted once each on front, top and bottom of pack. It must:

- be in a centred position
- be in Pantone Cool Gray 2 C
- be in Helvetica font size 14 point or less
- have only the first letter capitalised

The variant name must follow the same requirements other than to be size 10 point or less and positioned immediately below the brand name.

No promotional images or logos, additional colours or markings are allowed.

Shape

Specified packaging shapes. For cigarettes this is cuboid only and for hand-rolling tobacco this is cuboid, cylindrical or pouch.

Packaging materials

Specified packaging materials. For cigarettes this is carton or soft material only.

Minimum size

20 pack for cigarettes, 30 grams for hand-rolling tobacco.

Some products may require specific plain packaging requirements, for example hand-rolling tobacco pouches are permitted to have a re-sealable sticker and cigarette packets have a lining. If we proceed with the policy, we will engage further on the details of the plain packaging measures for specific products.

Do you agree or disagree with our proposal to introduce the plain packaging requirements outlined above for all tobacco products? This does not include cigarettes and hand-rolling tobacco which already have strict plain packaging requirements.

- **Agree**
- Neither agree nor disagree

- Disagree
- Don't know

Do you agree or disagree with our proposal to introduce the plain packaging requirements outlined above for heated tobacco devices?

- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Don't know

Do you agree or disagree with our proposal to introduce the plain packaging requirements outlined above for herbal smoking products?

- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Don't know

Do you agree or disagree with our proposal to introduce the plain packaging requirements outlined above for cigarette papers?

- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Don't know

Please explain your answers. This could include, for example, sharing your views on which tobacco products plain packaging requirements should or should not be introduced for, or specific elements of our proposals which you agree or disagree with. (Optional, maximum 600 words. Please do not include any personal information in your response.)

All tobacco products pose a risk to public health and should therefore be subject to consistent regulatory controls. Extending plain packaging requirement across all tobacco products will reinforce the message that there is no safe form of tobacco use and help prevent any perception that certain products are less harmful than others.

Plain packaging can help reduce the appeal of these products, particularly among children and young people, while ensuring that health warnings are more prominent and effective. It will also reduce opportunities for manufacturers to use packaging as a form of advertising.

Heated tobacco devices contain nicotine, which is highly addictive and has a range of harmful side effects. We therefore support measures that can reduce uptake and help those wanting to quit. Standardised packaging may also improve the visibility of safety information and assist enforcement officers in undertaking compliance checks.

Herbal smoking products are not a safe alternative to smoking tobacco. Applying plain packaging will help prevent any perception that they are less harmful and ensure that they cannot be promoted as such.

Cigarette papers should also be included as this will prevent tobacco companies from using these for marketing purposes.

2. Text health warnings on the packaging of heated tobacco devices and cigarette papers

We propose to introduce text health warnings on the packaging of heated tobacco devices and cigarette papers. All tobacco products and herbal smoking products already have these warnings. The wording of warnings will reflect the harms of using each product.

Do you agree or disagree with our proposal to introduce text health warnings on the packaging of heated tobacco devices?

- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Don't know

Do you agree or disagree with our proposal to introduce text health warnings on the packaging of cigarette papers?

- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Don't know

Please explain your answers. (Optional, maximum 600 words. Please do not include any personal information in your response.)

We agree that health warnings should be included on the packaging of heated tobacco devices as it is vital that consumers are aware the health risks associated with the use of these products. Given the increasing range of tobacco products on the market consumers may not fully understand the health risks associated with heated tobacco. Clear health warnings are therefore necessary to improve awareness and support informed decision making.

We agree that health warnings should be included on cigarette papers to ensure a consistent approach across all tobacco related products and to educate consumers about the risks associated with smoking, motivate them to quit and to help deter children and young people from starting to smoke.

Consideration should be given to ensuring that any health warnings on packaging are not to the detriment of the required safety warnings for electronic devices, including the

mandatory CE Markings and traceability requirements for heated tobacco devices. Any requirements should therefore ensure that sufficient space remains for all essential regulatory information.

3. Picture health warnings on the packaging of more products and devices

All smoked tobacco products currently require picture health warnings, excluding individually wrapped cigars and cigarillos, and packs of large cigars that weigh more than 3 grams each. These products only require text warnings on their packaging.

Smokeless tobacco products, heated tobacco devices and herbal smoking products currently do not have picture health warnings.

We propose to introduce picture warnings on the packaging of:

- all tobacco products (including all cigars and cigarillos, smokeless tobacco and heated tobacco)
- heated tobacco devices
- herbal smoking products

We do not propose including picture warnings for cigarette papers due to the typically smaller size of the packaging.

Do you agree or disagree with our proposal to introduce picture health warnings on the packaging of all tobacco products? This builds on requirements that are already in place for most tobacco products.

- **Agree**
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Don't know

Do you agree or disagree with our proposal to introduce picture health warnings on the packaging of heated tobacco devices?

- **Agree**
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Don't know

Do you agree or disagree with our proposal to introduce picture health warnings on the packaging of herbal smoking products?

- **Agree**
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree

- Don't know

Do you agree or disagree that picture health warnings should not be required on the packaging of cigarette papers? We do not propose including picture health warnings on cigarette papers due to the small size of the packaging.

- **Agree**
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Don't know

Please explain your answers. This could include, for example, sharing your views on which tobacco products health warning requirements should or should not be introduced for. (Optional, maximum 600 words. Please do not include any personal information in your response.)

We support the introduction of picture health warnings on the packaging of all tobacco products, heated tobacco devices and herbal smoking products. Pictorial warnings are more likely to be noticed than text-only warnings and are a cost-effective way to educate smokers about the associated health risks. Graphic visual warnings may also prevent children and young people from starting to smoke and help motivate those wanting to quit. Where possible combining picture health warnings, along with text is likely to strengthen the overall impact of the message.

Some promotion of herbal smoking has attempted to show these as a safer alternative to traditional smoking. Introducing picture health warnings would help ensure both current and potential future users are better informed about the associated health risks.

If health warnings are to be introduced, they should not be to the detriment of the required safety warnings for electronic devices, including the mandatory CE Markings and traceability requirements on the packaging of heated tobacco devices. Any requirements should therefore ensure that sufficient space remains for all essential regulatory information.

4. Pack inserts in packaging for all tobacco and herbal smoking products and heated tobacco devices

Quit themed pack inserts will soon be introduced for cigarettes and hand-rolling tobacco following previous consultation. We propose to also include quit themed pack inserts in the packaging of:

- all tobacco products (including products such as such as cigars, cigarillos, pipe tobacco, waterpipe tobacco and smokeless and heated tobacco)
- heated tobacco devices
- herbal smoking products

We do not propose including pack inserts in cigarette papers due to the small size of the packaging.

Do you agree or disagree with our proposal to introduce pack inserts for all tobacco products? This does not include cigarettes and hand-rolling tobacco which we are addressing separately to this consultation.

- **Agree**
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Don't know

Do you agree or disagree with our proposal to introduce pack inserts for heated tobacco devices?

- **Agree**
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Don't know

Do you agree or disagree with our proposal to introduce pack inserts for herbal smoking products?

- **Agree**
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Don't know

Do you agree or disagree that pack inserts should not be required in the packaging of cigarette papers? We do not propose including pack inserts for cigarette papers due to the small size of the packaging.

- **Agree**
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Don't know

Please explain your answers. This could include, for example, sharing comments on specific tobacco products for which you do or do not think pack inserts should apply. (Optional, maximum 600 words. Please do not include any personal information in your response.)

We agree that pack inserts should be introduced, where practical, for all tobacco products. They are a cost-effective way to highlight quit themed messages and promote cessation at a time when the product is about to be used. They have been introduced in several other countries, including Canada and Australia.

We also agree that pack inserts should be included in heated tobacco devices and herbal smoking products. These products are not risk free and it is important that users receive the same motivational quit messages and cessation advice as users of other tobacco products.

We agree that providing pack inserts for cigarette papers is impractical due to size constraints.

Specific requirements may be required for the labelling of separate components – i.e. electronic heating device hardware, tobacco / heat sticks or refills.

5. Time allowed to implement new packaging requirements

If and when new requirements are introduced, manufacturers will need time to update their packaging to comply. Retailers may also need time to sell old stock that does not comply with new law.

There should be a long enough notice period before new requirements come into force. This period would start from when the details of the new requirements are made clear. We have not yet decided what is the best way to share those details, but it could be, for example, in a government response to this consultation or when regulations are presented to the relevant national Parliament.

We propose that a minimum notice period of 12 months would be enough. This would mean all products covered by our tobacco packaging proposals would need to comply with any new requirements by the end of a 12-month implementation period. However, a longer or shorter notice period may be needed, and we welcome views on this.

Do you agree or disagree with our proposed implementation period of no less than 12 months (from when the detail of any new requirements is clear)?

- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree?
- Disagree
- Don't know

Please explain your answer. This could include, for example, sharing comments on whether the proposed implementation period should be shorter or longer, or on implications that the proposed implementation period could have for manufacturers, retailers or other groups. Please reference any evidence that you have considered to support your response. (Optional, maximum 600 words. Please do not include any personal information in your response.)

We believe that an implementation period of no longer than 12 months from the date requirements are introduced is necessary. This will allow manufacturers to adapt packaging and sell through existing stock. Any extension beyond what is necessary should be carefully considered as prolonged implementation may undermine the importance of the new requirements and the public health benefits

With advances in technology, it should not take long for new production lines to be introduced, and new packaging produced to meet the requirements.

Consideration could be given to an additional 6-month grace/transition period for retailers to allow them to sell through any lawful transitional stock.

Heated tobacco device appearance

6. Restricting the colour and finish of heated tobacco devices

We propose to restrict the colour of heated tobacco devices to Pantone 448C (drab dark brown) with an opaque matt finish. Pantone 448C is the same colour as cigarette and hand-rolling tobacco packaging.

Restricting the colour of the device in this way would also prevent certain aesthetic features on the device, such as the presence of cosmetic lights.

Do you agree or disagree with our proposal to restrict the colour of heated tobacco devices to Pantone 448C (drab dark brown) with an opaque matt finish?

- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Don't know

Do you agree or disagree that heated tobacco devices should be banned from having cosmetic lights? This will not apply to functional lights, like those that indicate charge level.

- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Don't know

Please explain your answers. This could include, for example, sharing comments on whether restricting heated tobacco devices to an alternative colour may be more effective, or whether technical exemptions are required. (Optional, maximum 600 words. Please do not include any personal information in your response.)

We believe that the colour and finish of heated tobacco devices should be standardised and subject to restrictions to reinforce the message that they are not harm-free. The use of colours and lights should be restricted to reduce opportunities for marketing and minimise their appeal to children and young people. Clear and comprehensive guidance should be provided to ensure that manufacturers fully understand what is permitted, while supporting effective consistent interpretation, compliance and enforcement of the legislation.

We agree restricting the colour of heated tobacco devices aligns these to all tobacco products and may help raise consumer awareness about the product's risks. For these

devices, the required product, safety and traceability information must be included. Therefore, the standardised colour of the device could potentially improve the visibility and consistency of safety markings and risk information, helping consumers recognise key information more easily.

We agree on a ban of cosmetic lights on these devices, as such features may imitate other consumer goods (games) and create confusion about the manufacturer, or undermine health warnings and consumer understanding of safe use and risks of the product.

7. Restricting branding, imagery and artwork on heated tobacco devices

We propose to ban heated tobacco devices from having images or artwork on them, except for any image that is a regulatory requirement, such as required warnings.

We also propose to limit branding to a single brand name, which would be subject to a set font, size and colour on the device.

Do you agree or disagree with our proposal to restrict all branding, imagery and artwork on heated tobacco devices?

- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Don't know

Please explain your answer. This could include, for example, sharing comments on which of the proposed restrictions you do or do not think should apply. (Optional, maximum 600 words. Please do not include any personal information in your response.)

We agree that the branding, imagery and artwork on heated tobacco devices should be restricted to reduce opportunities for marketing and reduce their appeal, particularly, among children and young people. Such measures could deliver public health benefits by preventing children and young people from starting to smoke and supporting those wanting to quit. Clear and comprehensive guidance should be provided to ensure that manufacturers fully understand what is permitted, while supporting effective consistent interpretation, compliance and enforcement of the legislation.

Restricting all branding, imagery and artwork could also simplify the appearance of the device, and subject to device size, may allow required safety warnings for electronic devices, and the mandatory CE Markings and traceability requirements to be more easily seen. However complicated artwork can be difficult to duplicate and counterfeit, and while this may assist with enforcement, restricted branding may make it more difficult for consumers to distinguish between devices and identify compatible consumables and accessories. A requirement for clear product identification of electrical devices helps to promote safer use.

8. Restricting digital screens on heated tobacco devices

We propose that digital screens on heated tobacco devices are restricted to only display safety and status information, such as battery levels.

Do you agree or disagree that digital screens on heated tobacco devices should be restricted to only the display of safety and status information such as battery level, and be greyscale in colour (black, white and grey only)?

- **Agree**
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Don't know

Please explain your answer. This could include, for example, sharing comments if you think there should be any exemptions to this proposal. (Optional, maximum 600 words. Please do not include any personal information in your response.)

We agree that the digital screens on heated tobacco devices should be restricted to prevent these being used for marketing purposes. This could help reduce the appeal of these products, particularly among children and young people, thereby supporting efforts to reduce their use and uptake.

Digital displays should be restricted to functional, safety and device status information and should not be used for promotional or branding purposes. Also, subject to the device size, a screen size could compete for space with mandatory product and safety information required on the device. However, for consumer safety, colour displays can provide important benefits by highlighting warnings, maintenance requirements, battery conditions and device faults more clearly than monochrome displays. The use of limited colours for these purposes may improve consumer understanding and support the safe operation of the device.

9. Stopping heated tobacco devices imitating other products

We propose to limit the potential appeal of heated tobacco devices by stopping them from looking like other products, such as drink bottles and game devices.

This proposal aligns with the restrictions we are proposing for vape devices. It will ensure that heated tobacco devices do not appear more attractive than vapes.

Do you agree or disagree that heated tobacco devices should not be permitted to mimic the design of other products and items? The objective of this proposal is to limit the appeal or attractiveness of heated tobacco devices.

- **Agree**
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Don't know

Please explain your answer. This could include, for example, sharing comments if you think there should be any exemptions to this proposal. (Optional, maximum 600 words. Please do not include any personal information in your response.)

We agree that heated tobacco devices should not mimic the design of other products. Products must be compliant with EU General Product Safety Regulations in that they must not imitate food. Legislation should prevent product endorsements that mislead consumers about the risks of using products that imitate other consumer goods (games devices) and create confusion about the manufacturer, or undermines health warnings and consumer understanding of safe use and risks of the product.

From a consumer safety perspective, requirements that prevent products from being designed to resemble toys, food, cosmetics or other everyday consumer goods would help reduce confusion about the nature of the product and its associated risks. Such measures may also help prevent accidental handling or misuse, particularly by children and other vulnerable groups.

10. Time allowed to implement new device requirements

If and when new requirements are introduced, manufacturers will need time to ensure their devices are compliant. Retailers may also need time to sell old stock that does not comply with new law.

There should be a long enough notice period before new requirements come into force. This period would start from when the details of the new requirements are made clear. We have not yet decided what is the best way to share those details, but it could be, for example, in a government response to this consultation or when regulations are presented to the relevant national Parliament.

We propose that a minimum notice period of 12 months would be enough. This would mean heated tobacco devices would need to comply with any new requirements by the end of a 12-month implementation period. However, a longer or shorter notice period may be needed, and we welcome views on this.

Do you agree or disagree with our proposed implementation period of no less than 12 months (from when the detail of any new requirements is clear)?

- **Agree**
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Don't know

Please explain your answer. This could include, for example, sharing comments on whether the proposed implementation period should be shorter or longer, or on implications that the proposed implementation period could have for manufacturers, retailers or other groups. Please reference any evidence that you have considered to support your response. (Optional, maximum 600 words. Please do not include any personal information in your response.)

We believe that an implementation period of no longer than 12 months from the date requirements are introduced is necessary. This will allow manufacturers to adapt and sell through existing stock. Any extension beyond what is necessary should be carefully considered as prolonged implementation may undermine the importance of the new requirements and the public health benefits. With advances in technology, it should not

take long for new production lines to be introduced, and new products produced to meet the requirements.

Consideration could be given to an additional 6-month grace/transition period for retailers to allow them to sell through any lawful transitional stock.

Vaping and nicotine product packaging and flavour descriptors

Definition of vaping products

Throughout this section, we refer to 'vaping products'. This includes vapes, as well as other vape components and refill containers sold separately from the device.

11. Restricting the colour on packaging for all vaping and nicotine products

We propose that the packaging for vaping and nicotine products should be white.

Do you agree or disagree with our proposal to restrict the colour of packaging of all vaping products to white?

- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Don't know

Do you agree or disagree with our proposal to restrict the colour of packaging of all nicotine products to white?

- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Don't know

Please explain your answers. (Optional, maximum 600 words. Please do not include any personal information in your response.)

We agree that the packaging for vapes and nicotine products should be plain and simple to reduce their appeal, particularly among children and young people who may be influenced by branding and appearance. Introducing a uniform white packaging requirement would help ensure that manufacturers clearly understand the requirements and ensure that the legislation is easily enforceable.

Colour restrictions can help reduce the risk of packaging resembling sweets, confectionery or other consumer goods, while safety information and health warnings may be displayed more prominently. However, packaging of vape components (contains e-liquid), requires safety warnings and symbols under the Classification of Labelling and Packaging legislation must be considered to ensure warning symbols remain visible and compliant –

i.e. in circumstances where warnings are specifically required to appear on a white or yellow background. Therefore, the standardised colour could potentially improve the visibility and consistency of safety markings and risk information, helping consumers recognise key information more easily.

12. Restricting imagery, branding, text and other promotional features

We propose that the packaging for all vaping and nicotine products should not include imagery, and that all text on the packaging, including any branding or brand names, should be in a standard colour, font and typeface.

There should be no other promotional features on the outside or inside of packs or attached to the packaging, such as links to social media accounts or any feature that suggests a financial benefit, such as vouchers or discounts.

We recognise that there may be a case to allow packaging of vaping products to display a picture of the product contained inside (for example, a mouthpiece). We welcome views on whether any limited exemptions may be appropriate in the free text box.

Do you agree or disagree with our proposal to introduce the restrictions to imagery, branding, text and promotional features outlined above for the packaging of all vaping products?

- **Agree**
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Don't know

Do you agree or disagree with our proposal to introduce the restrictions to imagery, branding, text and promotional features outlined above for the packaging of all nicotine products?

- **Agree**
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Don't know

Please explain your answers. This could include, for example, your views on whether there should be any exemptions or further restrictions. You may also indicate any elements of the proposal you disagree with and why, or elements you feel could be further strengthened. (Optional, maximum 600 words. Please do not include any personal information in your response.)

We believe that packaging for vape and nicotine products should be standardised in terms of size, colour and appearance, with all imagery removed and no marketing or promotional elements permitted. Such measures will help reduce the appeal of these products, particularly among children and young people and support those wanting to quit.

If any exemptions are permitted to allow pictures of the products on vape packaging the wording of the legislation should be clear to ensure that manufacturers are aware what is permitted and to support consistent and effective enforcement.

We agree in principle on the restrictions for vape and nicotine products packaging, providing this is not to the detriment of safety warnings for nicotine (as designated under the Classification, Labelling and Packaging legislation), electronic devices which are subject to CE Marking or traceability requirements as required under Market Surveillance Regulations (NI) 2021.

Harmonised packaging standards across the market should require clear and prominent product identification, safety information and user instructions. Also, include information such as nicotine strength, product compatibility, battery specifications and relevant safety warnings so that consumers can make informed purchasing and usage decisions. Simplifying the packaging should allow this safety information and warnings to be more visible. However, it is noted complicated artwork can be difficult to duplicate and counterfeit.

13. Restricting the shape, materials and safety features of packaging for all vaping and nicotine products

We propose that packaging used for vaping and nicotine products should use uniform shapes. For example, the packaging for devices or coils should use a similar shape, such as a rectangular cuboid, depending on their dimensions.

We also propose that manufacturers should not use materials that enhance a product's appeal, such as:

- glossy plastics
- holographic foils
- other tactile features, for example fuzzy or velvety materials

Do you agree or disagree with our proposal that packaging for all vaping products should have uniform shapes, and that there should be restrictions on materials and finishes that can enhance appeal?

- **Agree**
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Don't know

Do you agree or disagree with our proposal that packaging for all nicotine products should have uniform shapes, and that there should be restrictions on materials and finishes that can enhance appeal?

- **Agree**
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree

- Don't know

Vapes are already required to have child-resistant and tamper-evident packaging. We propose to introduce this requirement for all vaping and nicotine products.

Do you agree or disagree with our proposal that packaging for all vaping products should be both child-resistant and tamper-evident?

- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Don't know

Do you agree or disagree with our proposal that packaging for all nicotine products should be both child-resistant and tamper-evident?

- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Don't know

Please explain your answers. This could include, for example, indicating any elements of the proposal that you disagree with and why, if there are elements that you feel could be further strengthened or other features that should be included. (Optional, maximum 600 words. Please do not include any personal information in your response.)

We agree with any proposals restricting the shape, materials and finishes of vaping and nicotine products that will help reduce their appeal, particularly among children and young people. This could also provide a consistent approach that minimises consumer confusion and avoids potential misuse.

The requirement for child-resistant and tamper-evident packaging will help ensure the safety of the product and make counterfeit products more difficult to produce and easier to identify.

This would also support consumer protection, create clear user expectations and help ensure a consistent level of product safety across the market. A uniform approach may also reduce the likelihood of products being designed to resemble other consumer goods, helping to minimise consumer confusion and potential misuse. However, regulations should ensure that safety markings, warnings and user information remain clear and prominent so that consumers receive consistent risk information. Packaging should also include appropriate traceability information, such as serial numbers, batch numbers and manufacturer details, to support compliance checks.

14. Restricting flavour descriptions on vaping and nicotine products packaging

Single lead flavour

We propose to restrict flavour descriptors on the packaging for vaping and nicotine products to a single, recognised flavour name, like apple or strawberry. This would include restricting hyphenated or combined flavour names, such as blueberry-apple.

Do you agree or disagree with our proposal to restrict flavour descriptors on the packaging of all vaping products to a single lead flavour?

- **Agree**
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Don't know

Do you agree or disagree with our proposal to restrict flavour descriptors on the packaging of all nicotine products to a single lead flavour?

- **Agree**
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Don't know

15. Concept, sensory, food and drink categories

We also propose restricting any concept or sensory words from being used to describe a flavour.

A concept name refers to any flavour name that does not directly describe a recognisable food, drink or natural flavour. Instead, the word conveys a mood, an idea, a brand or even a number or codename, rather than describing an actual flavour. This could include flavour names such as:

- 'Unicorn Dream'
- 'DC100'

A sensory name refers to a recognisable taste, smell or sensation experienced when using a vape or nicotine product, such as 'Mint Blast'.

Do you agree or disagree with our proposal that concept and sensory flavour descriptors should be restricted on the packaging of all vaping products?

- **Agree**
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Don't know

Do you agree or disagree with our proposal that concept and sensory flavour descriptors should be restricted on the packaging of all nicotine products?

- **Agree**
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Don't know

We also propose restricting descriptor names of certain food and drink categories that appeal to children and young people. This includes flavours like:

- confectionery and sweets (such as 'Chocolate', 'Candy' and 'Bubblegum')
- desserts and cakes (such as 'Brownie' and 'Cheesecake')
- alcohol and other drinks (such as 'Cola')

Do you agree or disagree with our proposal that confectionery, sweets, dessert and cake name descriptors should be restricted on the packaging of all vaping products?

- **Agree**
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Don't know

Do you agree or disagree with our proposal that confectionery, sweets, dessert and cake name descriptors should be restricted on the packaging of all nicotine products?

- **Agree**
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Don't know

Do you agree or disagree with our proposal that alcohol and drink name descriptors should be restricted on the packaging of all vaping products?

- **Agree**
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Don't know

Do you agree or disagree with our proposal that alcohol and drink name descriptors should be restricted on the packaging of all nicotine products?

- **Agree**
- Neither agree nor disagree

- Disagree
- Don't know

Please explain your answers. This could include, for example, your views on any elements of the proposal that you disagree with and why, or any flavour names that you believe should or should not be restricted. You may also wish to comment on whether there should be any differences in how these restrictions apply to vaping and nicotine products. (Optional, maximum 600 words. Please do not include any personal information in your response.)

We strongly support any measures that would reduce the appeal of vape and nicotine products among children and young people. Restricting both the name and packaging to prevent the use of descriptors that are designed to attract people to buy could help reduce uptake and support those wanting to quit. A single lead flavour should be permitted to identify the flavour while alcohol descriptors and other terms that may enhance appeal should be prohibited.

The wording of the legislation would need to be carefully considered to ensure that it is clear, comprehensive and not open to interpretation or exploitation. Manufacturers should not be able to circumvent the intent of the legislation through the use of alternative words or descriptors that could be used in marketing to appeal to children and young people. Clear guidance should therefore be provided for both manufacturers and enforcement authorities to support consistent understanding, application and enforcement.

While we appreciate this intention, enforcement of such restrictions will be difficult without a clear mechanism for testing or analysis to compare flavours with those described. It is difficult to see how enforcement of this could be undertaken and by whom.

16. Product information on and inside vaping and nicotine products packaging

We propose that the packaging of all vaping and nicotine products should have:

- a full list of ingredients, including flavour agents
- expiration details
- an age restriction symbol, for example a crossed-out 18 symbol
- a standardised display of nicotine strength, for example in milligrams, millilitres or as a percentage
- nicotine delivery per puff or pouch, where relevant

We also propose that relevant products should have a nicotine warning label on the front and back of the packaging. For example, this warning could say 'This product contains nicotine which is a highly addictive substance'. Packaging should also have clear instructions on appropriate waste disposal.

Where applicable, we propose that certain products have an instruction leaflet to inform users of any appropriate warnings and the adverse effects of nicotine.

Do you agree or disagree with our proposal to require the consumer information listed above on and inside the packaging of all vaping products?

- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Don't know

Do you agree or disagree with our proposal to require the consumer information listed above on and inside the packaging of all nicotine products?

- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Don't know

Please explain your answers. This could include, for example, sharing comments on any elements of the proposal that you disagree with and why, if there are areas that you feel could be further strengthened or areas that have been missed and should be included. (Optional, maximum 600 words. Please do not include any personal information in your response.)

We agree consumer information provided on and inside the packaging of vaping and nicotine products strengthens the current approach and supports consumer protection by helping consumers make informed purchasing decisions, understand product hazards, follow safe usage instructions and avoid misuse. Information requirements on and inside packaging should be clearly defined and applied consistently across the market.

Also, clear traceability information should remain prominent on packaging. Challenges arise where enforcement officers are required to open packaging or break seals to verify product information. This can result in additional burdens for retailers through damaged stock, increased handling requirements and potential product wastage.

17. Time allowed to implement new packaging requirements

If and when new requirements are introduced, manufacturers will need time to update their packaging to be compliant. Retailers may also need time to sell old stock that does not comply with the new law.

There should be a long enough notice period before new requirements come into force. This period would start from when the details of the new requirements are made clear. We have not yet decided what is the best way to share those details, but it could be, for example, in a government response to this consultation or when regulations are presented to the relevant national Parliament.

We propose a minimum notice period of 12 months would be enough. This would mean all products in scope of our vaping and nicotine product packaging proposals would need to comply with any new regulatory requirements by the end of a 12 month implementation period. However, a longer or shorter notice period may be needed, and we welcome views on this.

Do you agree or disagree with our proposed implementation period of no less than 12 months (from when the detail of any new requirements is clear)?

- **Agree**
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Don't know

Please explain your answer. This could include, for example, sharing comments on whether the proposed implementation period should be shorter or longer, or on implications that the proposed implementation period could have for manufacturers, retailers or other groups. Please reference any evidence that you have considered to support your response. (Optional, maximum 600 words. Please do not include any personal information in your response.)

We believe that an implementation period of no longer than 12 months from the date requirements are introduced is necessary. This will allow manufacturers to change packaging and sell through existing stock. Any extension beyond what is necessary should be carefully considered as prolonged implementation may undermine the importance of the new requirements and the public health benefits. With advances in technology, it should not take long for new production lines to be introduced, and new packaging produced to meet the requirements.

Consideration could be given to an additional 6-month grace/transition period for retailers to allow them to sell through lawful transitional stock.

Clear guidance, commencement dates and evidence requirements for enforcement officers is essential to distinguish lawful transitional stock from non-compliant products, and assure consistent enforcement of the legislation throughout the UK.

Appropriate additional resources may be required to enable Councils to manage the transition effectively and to provide adequate notice and information to businesses and consumers. A 12-month implementation period would also allow enforcement authorities sufficient time to develop guidance, deliver training, and establish a compliance and enforcement work programme.

Vape device appearance

18. Restricting the colour and finish of vapes

We propose restricting the colour of vape devices, including all visible parts, to:

- white, black or grey, with only one of those colours per device
- a matt finish
- no variation in shades or opacity

Do you agree or disagree with our proposal to limit the colour of a vaping device (including all visible parts) to white, black or grey with a matt finish?

- **Agree**
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Don't know

Do you agree or disagree that vape devices should be banned from having cosmetic lights? This would not apply to functional lights, such as those that indicate charge level.

- **Agree**
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Don't know

Please explain your answer. This could include, for example, sharing comments on whether you think no restrictions should apply, if you think only a subset of the proposed colours should be allowed or if you think alternative colours should be allowed. Equally, you may want to highlight technical exemptions that should be considered. (Optional, maximum 600 words. Please do not include any personal information in your response.)

We agree that vaping devices should be restricted to plain standardised colours with a matt finish. There is no functional need for devices to have brightly coloured designs and cosmetic lights.

Standardised colour and finish of vapes helps move the consumer's focus from aesthetic appeal and encourage purchasing decisions based on product information. Permitting only a subset of colours will reduce the likelihood of appearance undermining the health and safety information, by improving the visibility of regulatory markings and warnings.

We support a ban on cosmetic lights on these devices, as such features may cause them to resemble other consumer goods (games) and create confusion about the manufacturer, or undermine health warnings and consumer understanding on safe use and risks of the product.

Restricting the appearance of these devices will help reduce their appeal among children and young people, helping to discourage uptake and supporting those wanting to quit.

19. Restricting branding, imagery, and artwork on vapes

We propose that vapes are banned from having images or artwork, except for where these may be a legal requirement, such as warnings.

We also propose that branding should be limited to a single brand name, which would be subject to a set font, size and colour on the device. This aligns with the restrictions we are proposing for heated tobacco devices.

Do you agree or disagree with our proposal to restrict all branding, imagery and artwork on vapes?

- **Agree**
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Don't know

Please explain your answer. This could include, for example, sharing comments on whether you think none or only some of the proposed restrictions should apply. (Optional, maximum 600 words. Please do not include any personal information in your response.)

We agree that branding, imagery and artwork should not be permitted on vapes. Such features have been used by manufacturers to increase their appeal and to portray vaping as being cool. Restricting these marketing elements will help reduce their appeal, particularly among children and young people, thereby supporting efforts to reduce their use and uptake.

From a consumer safety perspective a simplified device appearance, subject to the device size, may increase visibility of required safety warnings for electronic devices, and the mandatory CE Markings and traceability requirements. However complicated artwork can be difficult to duplicate and counterfeit. Also, restricted branding may make it more difficult for consumers to distinguish between devices and identify compatible consumables and accessories. A standardised requirement for clear product identification of electrical devices helps to promote safer use.

20. Restricting the digital screens on vapes

We propose that digital screens on vapes are prohibited, except for screens which display safety and status information such as battery and liquid levels.

Do you agree or disagree that digital screens on vapes should be restricted to only the display of safety and status information such as battery level, and be greyscale in colour (black, white and grey only)? This would not include lights that indicate status information, such as when the device is being recharged.

- **Agree**
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Don't know

Please explain your answer. This could include, for example, sharing comments if you think there should be any exemptions to this proposal. (Optional, maximum 600 words. Please do not include any personal information in your response.)

We agree that the digital screens on vapes should be restricted to prevent these being used for marketing purposes. This could help reduce their appeal particularly, among children and young people, thereby supporting efforts to reduce their use and uptake.

Digital displays should be restricted to functional, safety and device status information and should not be used for promotional or branding purposes. Also, subject to the device size, a screen size could compete for space with mandatory product and safety information required on the device. However, for consumer safety, colour displays can provide important benefits by highlighting warnings, maintenance requirements, battery conditions and device faults more clearly than monochrome displays. The use of limited colours for these purposes may improve consumer understanding and support the safe operation of the device.

21. Stopping vapes imitating other products

Currently vapes can and do copy the design of other products, such as highlighter pens, refillable water bottles and game devices.

We propose to limit the potential appeal of vapes by stopping them from looking like other products.

Do you agree or disagree that vapes should not be permitted to mimic the design of other products and items? The objective of this proposal is to limit the appeal or attractiveness of vapes.

- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Don't know

Please explain your answer. This could include, for example, sharing comments if you think there should be any exemptions to this proposal. (Optional, maximum 600 words. Please do not include any personal information in your response.)

We agree prohibiting vapes from imitating other products aligns with the proposed restrictions for heated tobacco devices and helps ensure a consistent regulatory approach across the market.

Food imitation legislation currently exists under EU General Product Safety Regulation 2023/988. However, work needs to be carried out to ensure this can be applied to vapes and vaping products. Legislation should prevent product endorsements that mislead consumers about the risks of using products that imitate other consumer goods (games devices) and create confusion about the manufacturer, or undermines health warnings and consumer understanding of safe use and risks of the product.

From a consumer safety perspective, requirements that prevent products from being designed to resemble toys, food, cosmetics or other everyday consumer goods would help reduce confusion about the nature of the product and its associated risks. Such measures may also help prevent accidental handling or misuse, particularly by children and other vulnerable groups.

22. Time allowed to implement new device requirements

If and when new requirements are introduced, manufacturers will need time to ensure their devices are compliant. Retailers may also need time to sell old stock that does not comply with new law.

There should be a long enough notice period before new requirements come into force. This period would start from when the details of the new requirements are made clear. We have not yet decided what is the best way to share those details, but it could be, for example, in a government response to this consultation or when regulations are presented to the relevant national Parliament.

We propose that a minimum notice period of 12 months would be enough. This would mean all vapes would need to comply with any new regulatory requirements by the end of a 12 month implementation period. However, a longer or shorter notice period may be needed, and we welcome views on this.

Do you agree or disagree with our proposed implementation period of no less than 12 months (from when the detail of any new requirements is clear)?

- **Agree**
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Don't know

Please explain your answer. This could include, for example, sharing comments on whether the proposed implementation period should be shorter or longer, or on implications that the proposed implementation period could have for manufacturers, retailers or other groups. Please reference any evidence that you have considered to support your response. (Optional, maximum 600 words. Please do not include any personal information in your response.)

We believe that an implementation period of no longer than 12 months from the date the requirements are introduced is necessary. This will allow manufacturers to change packaging and sell through existing stock. Any extension beyond what is necessary should be carefully considered as prolonged implementation may undermine the importance of the new requirements and the public health benefits. With advances in technology, it should not take long for new production lines to be introduced, and new devices produced to meet the requirements.

Consideration could be given to an additional 6-month grace/transition period for retailers to allow them to sell through lawful transitional stock.

Clear guidance, commencement dates and evidence requirements for enforcement officers is essential to distinguish lawful transitional stock from non-compliant products and assure consistent enforcement of the legislation throughout the UK.

Appropriate additional resources may be required to enable Councils to manage the transition effectively and to provide adequate notice and information to businesses and consumers. A 12-month implementation period would also allow enforcement authorities

sufficient time to develop guidance, deliver training, and establish a compliance and enforcement work programme.

Retail display

Requested temporary and incidental displays in England, Wales and Northern Ireland

Under existing legislation, tobacco products cannot be displayed inside or outside most shops across the UK. However, tobacco products can be shown to a customer following a request. The request must be by a person who is of the legal age of sale in England, Wales and Northern Ireland. We call this a 'requested temporary display' in this consultation.

Requested temporary displays enable informed purchasing decisions. As a result of a requested temporary display, other people nearby may also incidentally see these products. Current legislation in England, Wales and Northern Ireland also makes allowances for:

- restocking
- staff training
- pricing
- display unit maintenance

We call this 'incidental display' in this consultation.

23. Restricting the retail display of cigarette papers, heated and other tobacco-related devices and herbal smoking products in England, Wales and Northern Ireland

Tobacco products

We propose that the requested temporary display of all tobacco products should only be allowed from behind a sales counter, and not another location within a retail setting.

Do you agree or disagree with our proposal to introduce a legal requirement that the requested temporary display of all tobacco products must take place from behind a sales counter?

- **Agree**
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Don't know

Cigarette papers, heated and other tobacco-related devices and herbal smoking products

We propose that most of the restrictions and allowances that apply to the display of tobacco products should apply to cigarette papers, heated and other tobacco-related devices and herbal smoking products too.

This includes:

- restricting the display of these products outside of all retail settings and inside the majority of retail settings
- providing allowances enabling display unit restocking, maintenance, pricing, staff training and requested temporary displays
- permitting the same maximum visible areas (1.5 square meters)

We also propose that the requested temporary display of these products should only be allowed from behind a sales counter, and not another location within a retail setting in the same way as we are proposing to make this a legal requirement for tobacco products.

Do you agree or disagree with our proposal to restrict the display of cigarette papers? This would include the requirement that their requested temporary display must take place from behind a sales counter.

- **Agree**
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Don't know

Do you agree or disagree with our proposal to restrict the display of heated and other tobacco-related devices? This would include the requirement that their requested temporary display must take place from behind a sales counter.

- **Agree**
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Don't know

Do you agree or disagree with our proposal to restrict the display of herbal smoking products? This would include the requirement that their requested temporary display must take place from behind a sales counter.

- **Agree**
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Don't know

Please explain your answers. This could include, for example, sharing comments on why you think our proposed restrictions should or should not apply to certain types of products.

(Optional, maximum 600 words. Please do not include any personal information in your response.)

We agree that it should be a legal requirement that all requested temporary displays of tobacco products are made behind a sales counter to help ensure this is controlled by retail staff and viewed only by the customer. It will also ensure that the rules around temporary display are clear and will assist with consistent enforcement. This may also help prevent retailers from trying to circumvent the restriction by creating promotional display stands containing these products in a different shop floor area uncontrolled by staff.

We believe that all tobacco products and accessories should be subject to the same display restrictions. Cigarette papers are widely sold, including in shops not selling cigarettes or tobacco. Restricting their visibility would help reduce their accessibility and appeal and potential for impulse purchases. This may support those wanting to quit smoking and preventing children and young people from starting.

We believe that herbal smoking products, heated tobacco devices and other tobacco-related devices should be subject to display restrictions and only sold from behind a counter. By introducing the same restrictions for all tobacco products this highlights and reinforces the message to the consumer that these products are not risk free. This will also help prevent the normalisation of smoking related behaviours and reduce the potential for such products to act as a gateway to smoking cigarettes.

It is vital that all such products are subject to the same restrictions to minimise opportunities for impulse purchases and reduce their accessibility and appeal, particularly to children and young people.

24. Retail display of prices for cigarette papers, heated and other tobacco-related devices and herbal smoking products in England, Wales and Northern Ireland

Retailers can display prices for tobacco products in 3 formats:

- a single price list that can be permanently on display at each point of sale, but must be text-only and subject to size and font requirements
- a picture price list that can include product images and can only be shown in response to a request by a person who is of the legal age of sale
- small price labels that can be placed on the covered shelf or on the display unit where the product is kept, pending sale

We propose to apply the same price display principles to:

- cigarette papers
- all tobacco-related devices, including heated tobacco devices
- herbal smoking products

Do you agree or disagree with our proposal to restrict the display of prices for cigarette papers?

- **Agree**
- Neither agree nor disagree

- Disagree
- Don't know

Do you agree or disagree with our proposal to restrict the display of prices for all tobacco-related devices including heated tobacco devices?

- **Agree**
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Don't know

Do you agree or disagree with our proposal to restrict the display of prices for herbal smoking products?

- **Agree**
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Don't know

Please explain your answers. This could include, for example, sharing comments on why you think our proposed restrictions should or should not apply to certain types of products. (Optional, maximum 600 words. Please do not include any personal information in your response.)

We agree that the display of price lists for cigarette papers should be restricted in line with the current requirements for tobacco products. We also support extending these restrictions to price lists for herbal smoking products and tobacco-related devices, including heated tobacco devices to ensure a consistent approach for all smoking and tobacco related products

It is vital that size limits are not increased as price lists could easily become an alternative form of in store promotion.

In addition, we believe that there should be a restriction placed on retailers to ensure that price lists only show the current price and do not draw attention to price promotions or reductions.

25. Exemptions to display restrictions for tobacco products, cigarette papers, tobacco-related devices and herbal smoking products in England, Wales and Northern Ireland

Across the UK, there are exemptions that allow for tobacco products and their prices to be on display inside certain premises. These premises include:

- relevant trade premises (those that are only accessible to people that work in the tobacco trade)

- specialist tobacconists
- bulk tobacconists (including duty-free tobacco areas)

In England, Wales and Northern Ireland, we propose to maintain current exemptions for tobacco products for relevant trade premises and specialist tobacconists.

If and when additional retail display restrictions are brought in, we also propose that relevant trade premises and specialist tobacconists will continue to be allowed to display the following products, and their prices:

- cigarette papers
- heated and other tobacco-related devices
- herbal smoking products

We propose to remove the bulk tobacconist exemption for tobacco products and to not replicate it for any other products in scope of this consultation, since it presents a situation where products may be visibly accessible to the public, including children and young people.

Display exemptions for trade premises

Do you agree or disagree with our proposal to allow for the display of cigarette papers and their prices in relevant trade premises?

- **Agree**
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Don't know

Do you agree or disagree with our proposal to allow for the display of tobacco-related devices, including heated tobacco devices, and their prices in relevant trade premises?

- **Agree**
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Don't know

Do you agree or disagree with our proposal to allow for the display of herbal smoking products and their prices in relevant trade premises?

- **Agree**
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Don't know

Please explain your answers. This could include, for example, why you think certain exemptions should or should not be considered as well as any additional exemptions you think are necessary. (Optional, maximum 600 words. Please do not include any personal information in your response.)

We agree that for the purpose of those working in the trade it is reasonable that cigarette papers, herbal smoking products and tobacco related devices, including heated tobacco devices and their prices are displayed in relevant trade premises, provided access is restricted to those over 18 years of age.

Any exemption should only apply where access is restricted to persons engaged in the tobacco trade and is not available to the general public.

Display exemptions for specialist tobacconists

Do you agree or disagree with our proposal to allow for the display of cigarette papers and their prices inside specialist tobacconists?

- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Don't know

Do you agree or disagree with our proposal to allow for the display of tobacco-related devices, including heated tobacco devices, and their prices inside specialist tobacconists?

- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Don't know

Do you agree or disagree with our proposal to allow for the display of herbal smoking products and their prices inside specialist tobacconists?

- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Don't know

Please explain your answers. This could include, for example, sharing comments on why you think proposed exemptions should or should not be considered as well as any additional exemptions you think are necessary. (Optional, maximum 600 words. Please do not include any personal information in your response.)

We agree that the display of cigarette papers, tobacco-related devices, including heated tobacco, herbal smoking products, and their prices can be displayed within specialist

tobacconists, provided access is restricted to those over 18 years of age. They should not be able to have any advertisement visible from the outside of their premises. We believe that this should include price display lists as these could be used as a form of advertisement or to highlight promotions and be visible to children and young people.

Display exemptions for bulk tobacconists

We propose to remove the bulk tobacconist exemption for tobacco products and their prices and to not replicate it for any other products in scope of this consultation. Keeping the exemption would mean children and young people may still be able to see these products.

Do you agree or disagree with our proposal to remove and not replicate this exemption for all products in scope of this consultation?

- **Agree**
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Don't know

Please explain your answer. Where possible please include any information on any costs to bulk tobacconists associated with removing this exemption for tobacco products, including the number of businesses likely to be affected. (Optional, maximum 600 words. Please do not include any personal information in your response.)

We agree that bulk tobacconists should be subject to the same restrictions as other retail premises that sell tobacco products. It is important that these establishments do not become a loophole that undermines the spirit of the regulations. We also believe that the regulations should be extended to include a restriction on persons under the age of 18 being able to gain access to these areas. These areas should be subjected to age restriction and verification of age upon entrance.

Definition of vaping products

Throughout this section, we refer to 'vaping products'. This includes vapes, as well as other vape components and refill containers sold separately from the device.

26. Restricting the display of vaping and nicotine products across the UK

We propose that the display of vaping products and nicotine products is restricted.

We propose that the same allowances for temporary and incidental displays as we have proposed for most other products within scope of this consultation are applied across the UK. This includes a temporary requested display taking place behind a sales counter. This would make the maximum visible area permitted for a requested temporary display or incidental display:

- 1.5 square metres in England, Wales and Northern Ireland
- 0.1 square metres in Scotland

We also propose that a requested temporary or incidental display of vaping or nicotine products must not result in the display of:

- tobacco products (and smoking-related products in Scotland)
- cigarette papers
- heated and other tobacco-related devices
- herbal smoking products

Do you agree or disagree with our proposal to restrict the display of vaping products? This would include the requirement that their requested temporary display must take place from behind a sales counter.

- **Agree**
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Don't know

Do you agree or disagree with our proposal to restrict the display of nicotine products? This would include the requirement that their requested temporary display must take place from behind a sales counter.

- **Agree**
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Don't know

Do you agree or disagree that the requested temporary or incidental display of vaping and nicotine products should not result in the display of tobacco products (and smoking-related products in Scotland), cigarette papers, heated and other tobacco devices or herbal smoking products?

- **Agree**
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Don't know

Please explain your answers. This could include, for example, sharing comments on why you think our proposed restrictions should or should not apply to certain types of products. (Optional, maximum 600 words. Please do not include any personal information in your response.)

We agree that any display of vaping and nicotine products should not result in the display of any other product. Each product should be stored independently to ensure no deliberate or inadvertent display takes place during a request for one type of product.

We support the removal of the display of nicotine and vaping products as we believe this will reduce their appeal and availability to children and young people, and support those wanting to quit vaping or using nicotine products. In addition, ensuring that this display can only take place behind a sales counter will further strengthen these measures by ensuring products are managed and only visible to the requesting customer.

27. Display of prices of vaping and nicotine products across the UK

Across the UK, we propose to apply the same principles for the display of prices of tobacco products to:

- vaping products
- nicotine products

We propose that the price lists for vaping and nicotine products are permitted to also include nicotine strength and ingredients. This will help consumers make informed purchases.

We propose that separate price lists must be used for vaping and nicotine products and for tobacco products, for both permanently displayed price lists and picture prices lists, given vaping and nicotine products carry lower levels of harm than tobacco products.

Do you agree or disagree with our proposal to restrict the display of prices for vaping products, and allow for additional information on nicotine strength and ingredients?

- **Agree**
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Don't know

Do you agree or disagree with our proposal to restrict the display of prices for nicotine products and allow for additional information on nicotine strength and ingredients?

- **Agree**
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Don't know

Please explain your answers. This could include, for example, sharing comments on why you think our proposed restrictions should or should not apply to certain types of products. (Optional, maximum 600 words. Please do not include any personal information in your response.)

We agree that price lists for vaping and nicotine products should be aligned with tobacco products and additional information on ingredients and strength permitted.

28. Exemptions to display restrictions of vaping and nicotine products across the UK

Across the UK, it is permitted to display tobacco products inside premises that are only accessible to people working in the tobacco trade as long as this is not visible to the public from the outside. We propose to have this exemption to allow for relevant trade premises to display vaping products and nicotine products.

Do you agree or disagree with our proposal to allow for the display of vaping products in relevant trade premises?

- **Agree**
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Don't know

Do you agree or disagree with our proposal to allow for the display of nicotine products in relevant trade premises?

- **Agree**
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Don't know

Please explain your answers. If you have comments on business exemptions to our display proposals, please include them here. This could include, for example, why you think certain exemptions should or should not be considered as well as any additional exemptions you think are necessary. (Optional, maximum 600 words. Please do not include any personal information in your response.)

We agree that for trade only premises the display of vaping and nicotine products should be permitted, provided access is restricted to those over 18 years of age.

Any exemption should only apply where access is restricted to persons engaged in the tobacco trade and is not available to the general public.

29. Time allowed to implement all new display restrictions

If and when new requirements are introduced, retailers will need time to update their shops to comply with the necessary changes.

There should be a long enough notice period before new requirements come into force. This period would start from when the details of the new requirements are made clear. We have not yet decided what is the best way to share those details, but it could be, for example, in a government response to this consultation or when regulations are presented to the relevant national Parliament.

We propose that a minimum notice period of 6 months would be enough. This would mean the display of products in scope would need to comply with any new requirements by the end of a 6-month implementation period. However, a longer or shorter notice period may be needed, and we welcome views on this.

Do you agree with our proposal that there should be a minimum of 6 months' notice (from when the detail of any new requirements is clear)?

- **Agree**
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Don't know

Please explain your answer. This could include, for example, sharing comments on whether the proposed implementation period should be shorter or longer, or on implications that the proposed implementation period could have for manufacturers, retailers or other groups. Please reference any evidence that you have taken into account to support your response. (Optional, maximum 600 words. Please do not include any personal information in your response.)

We believe that 6 months is a reasonable time for retailers to implement the necessary changes to ensure the display restrictions are met. The introduction of the display ban for tobacco products highlighted that this could be achieved in a simple and cost-effective way.

We do not feel that any longer than 6 months is required. This balances the need for action, to remove promotional displays which may encourage children and young people from starting to use the relevant products and supporting those who wish to quit, with the time required for Councils to prepare for advisory and enforcement activities and for retailers to comply.

Consultation stage impact assessments

We have published consultation stage impact assessments alongside this consultation. The Scottish government, Welsh government and the Department of Health in Northern Ireland have also published impact assessments for proposals relating to retail display.

We would like to hear about any measurable impacts we have not considered in these initial impact assessments.

The data and evidence used in the impact assessments reflects the best available at the time of their completion in October 2025 (May 2026 for the impact assessment for Scotland and June 2026 for the impact assessments for Wales and Northern Ireland). Following this consultation, we will update the impact assessments as appropriate, including in consideration of information we gather through responses and any new data and evidence made available since their publication.

For each impact assessment, you will be asked the following questions. You can respond to as many questions and impact assessments as you want to.

For the retail display impact assessment, you can also respond about the impact assessments for Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland. Please make it clear which one you're responding to.

If you have any evidence or data to inform the assumptions or estimates in the consultation stage impact assessment, please enter it in the relevant free text box.

Please do not include any personal information in your response.

Provide any evidence to inform our estimates in the impact assessment of the benefits of the proposed policy. For example, information on the impact that options will have on the number of people using products in scope and/or health benefits associated with any reduction in usage. (Optional, maximum 600 words)

Provide any evidence to inform our estimates in the impact assessment of the costs of the proposed policy. For example, information on profit margins for manufacturers, wholesalers and retailers, and/or costs and process of product redesign. (Optional, maximum 600 words)

Specify any stakeholders that may be impacted by the proposed policy and/or costs and benefits that we have not identified in the impact assessment. (Optional, maximum 600 words)

Outline any potential unintended consequences of the proposed policy that we have not identified in the impact assessment. (Optional, maximum 600 words)

Provide any other comments to inform our assumptions or analysis in the impact assessment. (Optional, maximum 600 words)

File upload

If you would like to upload a document to support your submission, you will be able to do so. Please do not upload information that could identify you or another member of the public.

Unclassified

ITEM 9

Ards and North Down Borough Council

Report Classification	Unclassified
Exemption Reason	Not Applicable
	If multiple:
Meeting	Council
Date of Meeting	26 August 2026
Responsible Director	Director of Active and Healthy Communities
Responsible Head of Service	Head of Environmental Health and Regulatory Services
Report title	Consultation on Tobacco and Vapes: Packaging, Appearance and Display
Attachments	Appendix 1- Proposed Consultation Response
File Reference (if applicable)	CW14
Legislation	Other Tobacco and Vapes Act 2026
Resource Implications	None Narrative:
Screening Requirements	<i>The Council will commit to consider the implication of all reports under the categories of Section 75, Rural Needs, Data Protection, Climate and Sustainability:</i> Screening of report not required
Link to Corporate Plan Priority and Outcome	Priority 3: Social 6. Opportunities for people to be active and healthy If multiple:

Background

The UK Government and devolved administrations are committed to creating a smoke-free UK and reducing the harms associated with tobacco use, vaping and nicotine addiction.

Smoking remains the leading cause of preventable illness and premature death in Northern Ireland, contributing to over 2,000 deaths annually and exacerbating health inequalities. Although the use of heated tobacco products remains relatively low, awareness and availability of these products continue to increase. Importantly, there is no safe level of tobacco consumption, and all tobacco products pose a risk to health.

While vaping is recognised as less harmful than smoking, it is not risk free. The increasing use of vaping and nicotine products among children and young people has become a significant public health concern. Evidence indicates that product packaging, flavours, appearance and ease of access can increase the appeal of these products to children and young people.

In response to these ongoing public health concerns, the Tobacco and Vapes Act 2026 was introduced to strengthen the regulation of tobacco, vaping and nicotine products across the UK. The Act creates a smoke-free generation by prohibiting the sale of tobacco products to anyone born on or after 1 January 2009. It also strengthens enforcement powers and provides for further controls on the sale, advertising, promotion, packaging, appearance and display of tobacco, vaping and nicotine products. These measures are intended to reduce the appeal, accessibility and uptake of such products, particularly among children and young people.

Purpose of Consultation

This consultation seeks views on proposals relating to packaging, appearance and display of tobacco, vaping and nicotine products, with the aim of reducing their appeal and visibility, particularly among children and young people.

Information relating to the consultation is available via this link

[Tobacco and vapes: packaging, appearance and display - GOV.UK](#)

Key Areas

New Packaging Requirements

The consultation seeks views on introducing standardised packaging requirements for tobacco products that are not already subject to such controls, as well as cigarette papers, herbal smoking products, heated tobacco devices, vaping and nicotine products. Views are also sought on restricting flavour descriptors used for vaping and other nicotine products.

New restrictions on the Appearance of Vapes and Heated Tobacco Devices

The consultation proposes to introduce UK wide restrictions on the appearance of heated tobacco devices and vapes, including proposals relating to:

- Colours, images and branding
- Digital screens on devices;
- Devices imitating other products

New restrictions on Product Displays

The consultation also proposes restrictions on how cigarette papers, herbal smoking products, heated tobacco devices, vaping and nicotine products can be displayed in shops across the UK. Views are sought on which products should be covered and the nature of any display restrictions that should apply.

Next Steps

Environmental Health and Regulatory Services has prepared a draft consultation response, attached as Appendix 1. It reflects the regional position agreed through the EHNI Tobacco Control and Consumer Protection Subgroups and addresses the key public health and regulatory considerations arising from the consultation.

The proposed measures are consistent with the objectives of the Tobacco and Vapes Act 2026, supporting reduced smoking prevalence, prevention of youth uptake of vaping and nicotine products, and improved public health outcomes.

The draft response generally supports measures to reduce the appeal of these products, particularly to children and young people, and addresses relevant policy and enforcement issues. Please note that some questions have been excluded from the draft response, as they are optional requests for information on the individual submitting the response, and these will be left blank.

RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that Council **Approves** the proposed consultation response, attached as Appendix 1.

Unclassified

ITEM 12

Ards and North Down Borough Council

Report Classification	Unclassified
Exemption Reason	Not Applicable
	If multiple:
Meeting	Council
Date of Meeting	26 August 2026
Responsible Director	Chief Executive
Responsible Head of Service	
Report title	Notice of Motion Status Report
Attachments	Appendix 1 - Notice of Motion Tracker
File Reference (if applicable)	
Legislation	Local Government Act (Northern Ireland) 2014
Resource Implications	None
	Narrative:
Screening Requirements	<i>The Council will commit to consider the implication of all reports under the categories of Section 75, Rural Needs, Data Protection, Climate and Sustainability:</i> Screening of report not required
Link to Corporate Plan Priority and Outcome	Multiple Multiple If multiple: all

Background

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. It should be noted that as each Motion is dealt with it will be removed from the report.

RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that Council **Notes** this report.

To	Responsible Committee	Date Received	Submitted by	Notice (Original and any amendment)	Council & Committee Meetings (Date & Item)	Status (Most recent status update at the top followed by detail of what has been accomplished to date)	Responsible Officer	Final Outcome
11	Active & Healthy Communities	31.05.15	Councillor Muir & Alderman Keery	Rory McIlroy Recognition	Council June 2015 Corporate Services Committee October 2015	Officers discussing options with McIlroy Organisation. Proposal currently being drafted related to supporting young people in sport for their consideration and then will be reported to Council. The Chief Executive has now met with the Rory McIlroy Foundation and a proposal has been presented to them. Council is awaiting their decision, which will be brought back to Council as soon as it is available.	Adele Faulkner (Director of Active & Healthy Communities)	
370	Active & Healthy Communities	13.09.19	Councillor Cathcart & Alderman Gibson	That this Council acknowledges that Council byelaws are in need of review. Many of our Council byelaws are now outdated and do not cover new housing developments and playparks in the Borough. The Council therefore will carry out a comprehensive review of Council byelaws to create a modern system to assist the Council in meeting the outcomes identified within the Community Plan	Council - September 2019 Referred to Environment Committee - October 2019 Environment Committee 02.09.20 Item 12 Council - April 2025 Item 14	Report to be brought back on the possible strengthening of no alcohol consumption byelaws on Council land and at the Borough's beaches and parks. Report to also explore options on possible restrictions of open fires and the use of disposable BBQs at beaches and parks. Review of the byelaws to commence and be undertaken in three stages. Phase 1 - Scope, Phase 2 - Council Review and Phase 3 - Recommendation and Decision Financial provision 2026/27. Update to September A&HC Committee.	Gareth Kinnear Head of Environmental Health & Regulatory Services	
514	Environment	19.05.22	Councillor Cummings & Councillor Johnson	Business case for redesign of the parallel sports pitches and facilities at Park Way, Comber	Council June 2022 Community & Wellbeing Committee September 2022 and deferred to October 2022	Report back after rates set for 2027/28 Feasibility study agreed. Linked to Muckers Dog Park proposal. NOM assigned to EC 01.10.2025 following transformation Council agreed Comber 3G pitch is ranked 21st in project prioritisation. Stakeholder engagement to commence at the appropriate time. Leasing application has been received from Comber Rec.	Stephen Daye (Head of Parks and Cemeteries)	
522	Corporate Services	05.07.22	Alderman Irvine and Alderman Keery Amendment received from Councillor Cathcart	That this Council changes the name of Queen's Parade to Queen's Platinum Jubilee Parade in honour and recognition of the 70th anniversary of the Queen's accession to the throne. *** Amendment - That this Council, in recognition of Her Majesty's Platinum Jubilee and her conferment of City Status upon Bangor, agrees to name an appropriate place or building within Bangor in her honour and that future Council Bangor entrance signs make reference to Bangor being a Platinum Jubilee City.	Council July 2022 Environment Committee September 2022 Corporate Services January 2024	April 2023 - Letter requesting permission to use the Royal Name sent to the Cabinet Office and awaiting response January 2024 - Report brought to Corporate Committee Amendment Agreed and advice sought from Cabinet Office December 2024 - Advice still outstanding July 2026 - Advice now received, update report to be presented to Corporate Committee	Alison Curtis (Head of Corporate Governance)	

564	Environment	08.02.23	Alderman Irvine and Alderman Keery	That this Council tasks officers to begin discussions with the Education Authority with regards to the Future of Bloomfield playing fields, Bangor. This is to include the lease and the exploring of the possibility of bringing the facility up to intermediate level for football. A report to be brought back to Council following said discussions.	Council February 2023 Community & Wellbeing Committee March 2023	Report to be brought to November 2026 EC Report back when EA confirms its intentions Officers still awaiting response from EA at June 2026 NOM assigned to EC 01.10.2025 following transformation Officers awaiting response from EA in order for report to be brought back to future Environment Committee. EA has responded to say they '...would be in contact when they are ready to progress...' several chasers have been sent. 26.02.25 Email received from Virginia Lowe of the EA confirming there is no further update at this time. Compliance section continues to chase.	Stephen Daye (Head of Parks and Cemeteries)	
567	Corporate Services	14.02.23	Councillor Adair & Councillor Edmund	This Council rename the square at Portavogie War Memorial Queen Elizabeth Square in memory of our late Sovereign Queen Elizabeth II.	Council February 2023 Corporate Services Committee March 2023	A response has been received from the Cabinet Office and a report went back to Committee 30/5/24 - follow up letter sent to Cabinet Office for update. Letters sent to the Cabinet Office requesting use of the Royal Name July 2024 - Advice now received - Report presented at September CSC. Agreed that combined EQIA more appropriate. A further report to be brought to CSC when EQIA ready to go. July 2026 - Advice now received on other requests, update report to be presented to Corporate Committee	Alison Curtis (Head of Corporate Governance)	
586	Corporate Services	16.10.23	Councillor Cathcart & Councillor Martin	That this Council, further to recent positive discussions with landowners, agrees to reexamine the April 2014 decision of North Down Borough Council to accept a gift of open space at Ambleside, Bangor, which was never completed and tasks Council Officers to bring back a report looking at (i) acquiring the land and (ii) options around future uses for the land.	Council October 2023 Corporate Services Committee November 2023 Corporate Services Committee September 2024	Dec 2026 : The sellers' solicitors have confirmed that they were not willing to undertake first registration. Officers sought further legal advice and CLT agreed to refer the matter to Arthur Moir – the former Registrar of the Land Registry would be asked to provide advice on the various issues in the title and provide an indication of the likelihood of achieving Good Leasehold title. This will allow the Council to make a better informed decision on the purchase. This project is continuing to incur costs to the Council. January 2026 update : The former registrar of the Land Registry has just provided a report to Council's solicitor on the likelihood of Council achieving Good Title on the land at Ambleside and this looks positive. We are waiting for the Council's solicitor to provide advice on the Council's next steps and this will be in the next few weeks. March 2026 update : The Council's solicitor has advised that they are happy to rely upon the expertise of the former Registrar of the Land Registry, in that the risk to The Council is much lower than previously anticipated and the former Registrar's positive view on The Council achieving Good Title on the land at Ambleside. Officers shared this view and have instructed the solicitor to contact the sellers' solicitor to move this towards completion as soon as possible. April 2026 update: Officers received an update that one of the two landowners is still considering the matter (to dispose of the land to the Council), whilst one is ready to proceed. The Council's solicitor has given them a one-month deadline to move matters forward or the Council will withdraw. To date £1,700 of legal costs have been incurred on the matter and we await an up-to-date bill which will include the advice from the former Registrar of the land registry	Alison Curtis (Head of Corporate Governance)	

599	Active & Healthy Communities	21.11.23	Councillor Cathcart & Councillor Gilmour	“That this Council recognises the invaluable work undertaken by community/voluntary groups and organisations in this Borough in identifying and tackling the needs of communities and residents. The Council therefore, commits to undertaking a root and branch review of community development funding, arts and heritage, sports development and all other funding streams to ensure that it provides the most efficient, effective and responsive service to our community, thus maximising impact, accessibility and equitable allocation of resources. The review should examine the following 4 categories: (see further wording on agenda)	Council 20.12.23 Community & Wellbeing Committee January 2024 and April 2024 and June 2024 and September 2024 Corporate Committee September 2024	Project ongoing for 24 months with reports brought to C&W Committee as necessary. First working group was on 10th May 2024. Grants transformation project already underway. Regular Updates will be brought. Update to September A&HC Committee	Arlene Barton (Head of Community and Culture)	
619	Environment	29.05.24	Councillor Cochrane and Councillor Thompson	That this Council notes with concern the temporary closure of Groomspoint Tennis Courts due to issues around the safety of the playing surface. Further to this Council tasks officers to bring back a report on Tennis Court maintenance throughout the Borough and will commit to ensuring all our Tennis Court facilities are properly maintained and are fully accessible to all. Council will also promote the use of Tennis facilities in the Borough as we approach the spring/summer season.	Council 29.05.24 Item 20.1 Community & Wellbeing 15.01.25 Item 5 Environment Committee 07.01.26 Item 8	Report to be brought to October 2026 EC Parks and Regeneration have met to discuss - alternative funding streams being investigated. Report back when further information is available. Agreed at EC 07.01.26: That the Development of the Greyabbey MUGA Project be delivered as a joint Village Renewal and Parks Project with progress report coming to the Council. Agreed at C&W 15.01.25: That the Council agree the recommendation of the Committee but further tasks officers to explore the feasibility of incorporating a MUGA as part of the redevelopment of Greyabbey Tennis Courts including engagement with current users, sports clubs and community groups to ensure use for all sports and maximum investment and sport participation for the community of Greyabbey. Assigned to January 2025 C&W Agenda. Moved to EC due to restructure.	Stephen Daye (Head of Parks and Cemeteries)	
624	Corporate Services	20.05.24	Councillor Kendall, Alderman McRandal and Alderman Graham	This Council notes that, subsequent to submission of a Notice of Motion in 2017, Council agreed to provide funding to assist in the building of a new war memorial in Conlig village; and to liaise with, and assist, the Conlig War Memorial Project Group in their efforts to build a monument to the seventeen men who are known to have lost their lives in World War I.	Council - May 2024 Corporate Services Committee June	January 2026: This matter is progressing in line with the actions agreed by both The Council and Conlig Community Regeneration Group. The NIHE has agreed to the sale of the land and it is with LPS for a valuation. March 2026 update: This matter is progressing in line with the actions agreed by both The Council and Conlig Community Regeneration Group. The NIHE has agreed to the sale of the land, and it is with LPS for a valuation. A site meeting took place in early March with representatives of the group and the Estates team to discuss the next steps for the construction of the Memorial and landscaping of the site. April 2026 update: As March update - The group has fundraised £8,000 towards the project, but the balance, which the Council agreed to pay, is likely to be in the region of £30,000. July 2026: Update report at July Council meeting	Alison Curtis (Head of Corporate Governance) & Peter Caldwell (Head of Estates)	

632	Environment	21.08.24	Councillor Irwin and Alderman McRandal	That this Council tasks officers with producing a report outlining how pedestrian access to Household Recycling Centres in the Borough could be facilitated. This report should include consideration of health and safety requirements, the HRC booking system and the ability to provide pedestrian access in other council areas in Northern Ireland.	Council September 2024 (Item 13.2) Environment Committee 2 October 2024 (Item 11.1) Environment Committee 7 May 2025 (Item 3) Environment Committee 3 December 2025 (Item 4) 8 April 2026 (Item 6)	Report to be brought to September 2026 in advance of Business Case Agreed at April 2026 EC - based on Option 1: That the Committee notes the report and tasks Officers to prepare a business case for the investment that would be required to introduce pedestrian access at Holywood and Millisle HRCs. A further report, including analysis of demand, is to be presented to Committee in advance of the business case being considered during the 2027/2028 rates setting process. Agreed not to continue with the pedestrian access arrangements in their current form. Furthermore, officers to investigate other means of safely providing pedestrian access to HRC sites alongside vehicular access and report the outcome of this to a future meeting. Agreed at EC 7 May 2025 to proceed with a three-month trial at Holywood and Donaghadee HRCs Agreed at April 2025 Environment Committee to proceed with Option 3 for a pilot scheme in Holywood and Donaghadee HRCs in order to obtain a proper evidence basis for demand; and that consideration of pedestrian access is included in the work around the future of the HRC estate as outlined in Option 1. Further report to follow. Agreed at Environment Committee 2 October 2024	Keith Patterson (Head of Waste and Cleansing)	
638	Place & Prosperity	22.10.2024	Councillors Harbinson & McCracken	That this Council should: 1. Prepare a visual map for all public sector land in Bangor City Centre and Ards Town Centre and colour code holdings that are potentially connected with future developments (even if not yet fully agreed), including Bangor Waterfront, Queen's Parade, Newtownards Citizen's Hub and the Council's Car Park Strategy. This includes public land belonging to the Council and NI Executive Departments. 2. To further identify public sector land that is currently unproductive and outside the scope of wider strategies, which could be made available for future private sector development. This includes land that is either vacant, contains empty or derelict buildings, or contains buildings that are under-utilised or dated to the point that redevelopment is required. The map should also include land that is facilitating meanwhile use. 3. Prepare a summary report to highlight how unproductive public sector land could be re-purposed and how such a process could be progressed within the bounds of current planning considerations and Council/Executive disposal policies.	Place & Prosperity Committee November 2024 (Item 14.2) Council October 2024 (Item 23.5)	Report brought to 7 May P&P Committee 2026 and ratified by May Council - report and move to Stage 2 agreed. Follow-up report to future Cttee and consideration of a public Council-managed list of long-term vacant/derelict properties list to support public input/expressions of interest. Strategic Development, Lands, and the GIS officer met 16.10.25 to discuss how to get the information from GIS. Update to be provided to Elected Members by 17.10.25 Update report to P&P in the first quarter of 2026 Agreed at 7 Nov 2024 P&P and ratified by 27 Nov Council 2024 - initial report to be brought back to future P&P Committee	Director of Place and Prosperity	
640		05.11.2024	Councillor Cochrane and Alderman Adair	That this Council condemns the failure by the UK Government to prioritise farming families and the rural economy as part of the Autumn Budget; notes with deep concern the decisions to introduce new thresholds for Inheritance Tax and Agricultural Property Relief, which will jeopardise succession planning on farms and discourage investment in many farm businesses.	Council meeting 27.11.2024 - Heard and agreed.	Letter sent to Minister on 9 December and response received 13 January. Report to go to January Council.		

657	Environment	18.02.2025	Alderman Adair & Councillor Edmund	That Council task officers to bring forward a report on options and potential funding opportunities to enhance and improve Council Football Pitches at Islandview Road Greyabbey to ensure future intermediate football standards by the local sporting clubs and community of Greyabbey.	Council 26.02.2025 - Community & Wellbeing Committee March 2025	Options agreed with stakeholders – report to EC after 27/28 rates agreed NOM assigned to EC 01.10.2025 following transformation Agreed that Council task officers to bring forward a report on options and potential funding opportunities to enhance and improve Council Football Pitches at Islandview Road Greyabbey to ensure future intermediate football standards by the local sporting clubs and community of Greyabbey	Stephen Daye (Head of Parks and Cemeteries)	
658	Place & Prosperity	03.03.2025	Councillor McClean & Councillor Cathcart	That Council notes the tired and inconsistent presentation of Christmas lights and illuminations in Bangor City Centre, particularly during the Christmas period, and considers potential festive lighting improvements for Christmas 2025. Further, that Council tasks officers to bring back a report presenting options that draw on successful practice and displays elsewhere, including the use of festoon lighting over Main Street. The report should look at the feasibility of the future expansion of these concepts to the remainder of the Borough, if proven successful in Bangor.	Council 26.03.2025 Environment Committee 02.04.2025 Environment Committee 11.06.25 Council 25.06.25	Further report to Sept P&P Update brought to P&P 11.6.26 as part of LAG Minutes Place and Prosperity Committee now progressing this Update report to be brought to EC May 2026 Agreed the proposals in the update report in relation to Christmas Lighting in Bangor, utilising DfC funding wherever possible, with any shortfall coming from existing Christmas Lighting maintenance budgets. Agreed to adopt Notice of Motion - Environment Committee 02.04.2025. Report to future EC.	Director of Place & Prosperity	
671	Active & Healthy Communities	20.05.25	Councillor Kendall and Councillor McKee	Responsible Dog Walking in Public Spaces. This Council, as a 'Dog Friendly Borough' recognises the increasing use of public parks and footpaths by professional and recreational dog walkers, and the need to balance animal welfare, public safety, and the enjoyment of public spaces for all of our Borough's residents. This Council notes that: Multiple dogs under the control of a single individual may pose challenges to effective management and public safety. Excessive numbers of dogs being walked simultaneously can lead to increased risk of dog fights, interference with other park users, fouling, and uncontrolled behaviour; There has been an increasing number of professional dog walkers, offering services within the Borough and there is a lack of licencing, registration or other requirements which may lead to inadequate insurance, training and experience, adding further potential risks to people and pets; and - Many local authorities across the UK, including our neighbour Belfast City Council, have introduced limits on the number of dogs that may be walked at one time. The Council therefore resolves to: Produce a report outlining the costs and steps required to introduce a local restriction under the relevant provisions of the Clean Neighbourhoods and Environments Act (Northern Ireland) 2011: Limiting the number of dogs that any one person may be in charge of to a maximum of four at any given time in public spaces. Mandating that professional dog walkers must have dogs on leads at all times to ensure dog control and accountability for dog behaviours. Include in the report, the provision and cost of a complementary public education campaign, to inform residents, recreational and professional dog walkers about the new limit, about what it means to have a dog under your control in public spaces (whether on or off lead), and what promoting responsible dog control and safety in shared spaces should be. To write to the DAERA Minister to ask him to introduce, and provide funding support to Councils to enforce, mandatory registration of professional dog walkers to help to ensure suitable animal welfare standards, the provision of suitable training, experience, insurance, and public safety.	Council 25.06.25 Environment Committee - September Item 20.1	Agreed to adopt NOM at September 2025 EC Assigned to September 2025 EC Agenda. Moved to A&HC due to restructure. Update to March 2026 A&HC Committee. Letter sent to Andrew Muir 12.02.26 by CE. Update to May A&HC Committee. Consultation published June 2026. Report to September A&HC Committee.	Gareth Kinnear Head of Environmental Health & Regulatory Services	

672	Place & Prosperity	20.05.25	Councillor McCracken and Councillor Harbinson	Amendment to Notice of Motion 672 submitted by Councillor McCracken and Councillor Harbinson "This Council welcomes the update on Marine Gardens provided by Bangor Marine on 13 August 2025 and agrees that: 1.Council officers should work alongside Bangor Marine to support public communication around this project. This includes inviting Bangor Marine to the next meeting of the Bangor CAG to update stakeholders, supporting the proposed public consultation hub led by Bangor Marine, and by holding regular meetings with Bangor Marine to ensure accurate and complementary messaging on respective websites, newsletters and social media. 2.Council should also work with Bangor Marine to support a commercial marketing plan with the aim of attracting investment for the further phases of Queen's Parade along with complementary investment that will support the ambitions of the wider City Deal. An initial outline should be brought to Committee in Q1 2026 with a view to approve draft marketing collateral that can be used at future property investment conferences in the UK and abroad."	P&P 4.9.25 Council 25.06.25	Report to be brought to future Committee 1. BM to be invited to next CAG (soon to be relaunched as LAG, likely Jan/Feb 2026 whilst the C/TAG to LAG process is formalised 2. Re: commercial marketing plan, update report to P&P in first quarter of 2026. Agreed to adopt NOM at Sept 2025 P&P - ratified at Sept 2025 Council	Director of Place and Prosperity	
673	Environment	21.05.25	Alderman Graham and Councillor Cochrane	That this Council notes the popularity of public spaces such as beaches during the summer months. Further to this Council will task officers to bring back a report to explore options for the extension of public toilet opening hours during the summer months to 9pm near beaches and other busy areas. Council Officers will further bring back a report on expanding baby changing facilities within our Borough at public toilets.	Council 25.06.25 Environment Committee - September Item 20.2 Environment Committee 03.12.2025 Item 3 Environment Committee 04.02.26 Item 4	Update report to be brought in 2027 Agreed at EC 04.02.26: AMENDMENT AGREED. That we accept officer proposal with the addition of a review in one year's time to ascertain usage and value for money Report brought to December 2025 EC: ALTERNATIVE RECOMMENDATION AGREED to note the report and bring back a report on costs and options on extending the summer opening hours to cover April and September as well as May to August, to redevelop and relaunch a community scheme to increase provisions for the public during the summer months and review its impacts in order to bring a report back to Council after a period of review. Agreed to adopt NOM at September EC Assigned to September 2025 EC Agenda	Keith Patterson (Head of Waste and Cleansing)	
680	Active & Healthy Communities	05.09.25	Councillor Cochrane and Councillor Edmund	That this Council recognises the importance of every child having the opportunity to learn to swim - a vital life skill that supports physical health, mental wellbeing, and water safety. Swimming is not only one of the most effective forms of exercise, but also a key activity for building confidence and resilience in young people. Further to this Council agrees to- 1. An Audit of current indoor swimming lesson provision and also open water safety awareness programmes across the Borough against local demand; and 2. The development of a strategy to ensure that no child is denied access to swimming lessons or safety awareness programmes due to cost or capacity.	Council 24.09.25 - October Active and Healthy Communities Committee	Leisure Officers to progress. Report to September Committee	Anton Cozzo Head of Leisure	
681	Corporate Services	09.09.25	Alderman McIlveen and Councillor Cathcart	That this Council expresses its deep disappointment at the correspondence sent to each councillor in Northern Ireland by NAC NI dated 2 September 2025 recommending that councillors take "industrial" action and considers the balloting of members to take any form of strike action is inappropriate, ill-judged and unlawful. Notes that the eleven Councils in Northern Ireland pay a corporate rate to fund the NAC NI in Northern Ireland and that individual councillors are by default members of NAC NI rather than by choice. Is further of the view that if the NAC NI wishes to act like a union then it should be governed by the same laws as any other union and that membership should be voluntary and a matter for individual councillors rather than funded by the ratepayer. As such, this Council agrees to withdraw its corporate funding from the NAC NI, writes to inform the NAC NI of this decision and calls on the executive members of the NAC NI to resign their positions given the gross over-reach of this correspondence and how it has brought the role of hard-working councillors into disrepute.	Council 24.09.25 - October Corporate Services Committee	Added to the agenda for CS 14/10, 14/11 letter sent to NAC NI by CEX. NAC NI have confirmed that this will be discussed at the meeting of their Executive Committee in December and that they will respond after this. NAC attended March Council for Deputation. Remove from tracker after ratification by April Council.	CEX Office	

682	Corporate Services	17.09.25	Alderman Graham and Councillor Gilmour	Council recognising the importance of Holywood as a Garrison town, seeks in conjunction with the Craigavad and Helen's Bay Branch of the Royal British Legion, to bring a military event to Holywood.	Council 24.09.25. Corporate Services Committee	December update : Meeting to take place in Jan 2026 to work up proposal. Once there is a proposal a report will be presented to Committee. January 2026 update : Meeting has taken place, draft plan proposed, facilitator to confirm with relevant parties . Further meeting to confirm arrangements in March and report will be brought back then. July 2026 update: Report will be brought to Committee as soon as possible.	Alison Curtis (Head of Corporate Governance)	
684	Environment	10.10.25	Councillor Hennessy and Alderman Brooks	That this Council brings back a report, with associated costs, detailing the possible road safety and lighting improvements that could be made between Donaghadee harbour and Donaghadee Community Centre.	Council 29.10.25 Environment Committee	Report to be brought to October 2026 EC Agreed to adopt NOM at November EC 2025 - ratified at November 2025 Council Assigned to November 2025 EC Agenda	Peter Caldwell (Head of Estates)	
685	Active & Healthy Communities	14.10.25	Councillor Kendall and Councillor S Irvine	This Council recognises the link between domestic abuse and non-accidental harm to companion animals and the emotional trauma this causes victims and survivors, acknowledging that companion animals are often used as tools of coercion and control in abusive relationships and that their welfare is intrinsically linked to the safety and wellbeing of victims. The introduction and implementation of Ruby's Law, as proposed in other parts of the UK, seeks to provide legal protection for pets in households where domestic abuse occurs, ensuring that they are considered in protective orders and safeguarding measures. Therefore, this councils resolves to: 1. The introduction of Ruby's Law in Northern Ireland; and 2. Them to work in partnership to deliver a cross-departmental collaboration with Causeway Coast Dog Rescue charity, and other animal welfare and domestic abuse organisations as required, to ensure the development of robust and enforceable provisions, taking a multidisciplinary approach to identify key stakeholders and government agencies to support victims and survivors of domestic abuse and coercive relationships and the protection of their pets. 3. Promote public awareness of the connection between domestic abuse, coercive control and animal abuse, in collaboration with statutory agencies and animal welfare organisations. 4. Encourage engagement and collaboration within all Councils and other key stakeholders to support the implementation of Ruby's Law in the community to protect animals and people.	Council 29.10.25 AHC	Report to March 2026 A&HC Committee. Update to September A&HC Committee	Gareth Kinnear (Head of Environmental Health and Regulatory Services)	
686	Corporate Services	15.10.25	Councillor Cochrane and Councillor Gilmour	That this Council is deeply alarmed that the definition of victim in the Victims and Survivors (Northern Ireland) Order 2006 does not distinguish between those who perpetrated wrongdoing during the Troubles and the innocent victims they harmed, injured, killed or bereaved; believes that innocent victims should not have to interact with terrorists and their supporters when accessing victim support services; asserts that there is no moral equivalence between victim-makers and innocent victims; welcomes the fact that the victims pension legislation makes a clear distinction between perpetrator and victim; condemns the Alliance Party's decision to intentionally blur this line by removing the word "innocent" from the description of a victim in a recent Assembly motion addressing the legacy of the past; and resolves to write to the Justice Minister requesting that she personally apologise for suggesting that victim makers could also be considered victims.	Council 29.10.25 Corporate Services Committee	Reply received from Justice Minister and report to CS Feb 2026. Further response from the Chief Executive sent following meeting. Letter from Justice Minister reported and agreed at April Corporate Services Committee. To be removed following ratification after April Council meeting.	CEX Office	

687	Active & Healthy Communities	16.10.25	Councillor McCollum and Councillor Wray	That this Council recognises the valuable work undertaken by the Community Safety team in tackling anti-social behaviour throughout the Borough. That this Council also acknowledges the significant and increasing pressures on those officers to meet the growing and complex demands of their workload. Furthermore, that Council notes the recent review of the criminal legislative framework to help tackle Anti-Social Behaviour and the greater powers which may devolve to Council, and tasks officers to prepare a report which outlines the needs of the Borough in relation to community safety and the resources currently available, details a range of measures appropriate to address those needs, including recruitment of additional officers, and identifies requisite funding requirements and opportunities.	Council 29.10.25. AHC	Deferred to December A&HC Committee. Report to March A&HC Committee. Further report on completion of re-structure. Update to December 2026 A&HC Committee.	Arlene Barton (Head of Community and Culture)	
692	Active & Healthy Communities	12.11.25	Councillor McKee and Councillor Kendall	This Council notes with deep concern the recent deaths of two-family dogs in our Borough, linked to panic caused by fireworks and the many other animals that suffer year on year. We recognise the severe distress fireworks cause to people, pets, livestock, and wildlife, and the growing public concern over unregulated use. We express our sympathies to the affected families and commend local animal welfare groups for their ongoing support. This Council writes to The Department of Justice to request the commission of an urgent review of Northern Ireland's fireworks legislation, to include: Further that Council works with AND PCSP to explore how we can effectively tackle the antisocial behaviour associated with fireworks.	Council November 26.11.25 Active and Healthy Communities Committee	Officers to progress. Letter to go to DoJ when Call in expires after Jan 2026 Council. To go to next PCSP Committee (ND to action). On agenda for October PCSP. Update to Noember A&HC Committee.	Gareth Kinnear Head of Environmental Health & Regulatory Services & Nikki Dorrian (Interim Head of Community)	
693	Corporate Services	26.11.25	Alderman McRandal and Alderman McAlpine	That this Council notes with concern the signs of erosion which have arisen on Station Road, Craigavon in recent years and that this Council recognises that Station Road, Craigavad is an integral section of the North Down coastal path and the Ulster Way. That this Council reassess whether it has responsibility for maintaining the road and for strengthening the sea wall and sea defences along the North Down coastal path section of Station Road, in view of: the fact that Council was prepared to assume responsibility for the road and sea defences under the failed Greenway project; the fact that this is a right of way as asserted by Council. That a report is brought back to the relevant Committee, to include assessment of who owns or is responsible for the upkeep and maintenance of the sea wall and sea defences along Station Road.	Council December 2025 Environment Committee 7 January 2026 Item 9.2	Report to be brought to a future meeting of the Corporate Services Committee to include legal advice regarding responsibility for the sea defence wall. NOM reassigned to Corporate Services Committee 11.02.2026 April 2026 update : Seeking legal advice, report will be brought back as soon as possible. Agreed to adopt NOM at January 2026 Environment Committee July 2026 update - Investigations ongoing	Alison Curtis (Head of Administration)	
694	Corporate Services	27.11.25	Councillor Ashe and Councillor McBurney	That this Council returns a report researching paternity leave provision for council employees including, but not limited to: benchmarking of paternity leave provision against appropriate organisations; options to improve paternity leave policy for council employees; projected costings of these options; and anything else officers deem prudent.	Council December 2025 and Corporate Services Committee January 2026	Corporate Committee decision 13 January 2026 decision to defer. On CS February 2026 agenda. 9.3.2026 - Ratified minute sent to Head of HR.	Head of HR	This work is still being undertaken

697	Active & Healthy Communities	08.12.25	Councillor Douglas and Alderman Cummings	That this council is deeply concerned regarding the length of time that people battling with Motor Neurone Disease must wait to receive help through the Northern Ireland Housing Executive Disabled Facilities Grant. To write to the Chief Executive of the Northern Ireland Housing Executive and the Minister for Communities to ask what the current length of time is for MND sufferers to have home adaptations completed and to ask them to implement a scheme to fast track these vital and much needed home adaptations.	Council December 2025 and Active and Healthy Communities Committee Jan 2026	Deferred to February A&HC Committee and adopted. Letter sent 21 May 2026. Response to September A&HC Committee.	Arlene Barton (Head of Community and Culture)	
698	Active & Healthy Communities	09.12.25	Councillor Wray and Councillor Chambers	Council acknowledges the vital role that our voluntary community groups play across the borough. Through our grants programmes these groups deliver initiatives such as community events, sporting activities, and festivals promoting tourism. As we rely on these groups to continue this important work across the borough, we must ensure they are supported, and that the management of these grants is easy to navigate. Advance payments are essential for small organisations who don't have large reserve sums of money in their bank accounts. Another complication for groups is being passed across various council departments during the delivery of their initiative. In order to improve this process, Officers will bring back a report considering the implications of making the following changes: • The advance payments available to groups is extended to 80%. • If a group is successful in a funding application they will be allocated an officer within council who will act as the only point of contact between the group and Council.	Council December 2025 and Active and Healthy Communities Committee Jan 2026	Report to June A&HC Committee & Head of Finance to attend committee meeting. Report to September 2026 A&HC Committee.	Arlene Barton (Head of Community and Culture)	
699	Corporate Services	09.12.25	Councillor McBurney and Councillor McCollum	That this Council notes with concern the increased cost of living and the impact this has upon families and individuals within the Borough; further notes that the absence of a clear Anti-Poverty Strategy makes it challenging to understand and strengthen our role in alleviating poverty and reducing inequality and therefore tasks Officers with bringing forward proposals to enhance the effectiveness of Council's contribution to poverty alleviation, including but not limited to, funding allocated to volunteer led community groups involved in poverty alleviation work. This work should complement, and not duplicate, any borough-wide Anti-Poverty action planning being undertaken by external partners.	Council December 2025 and Corporate Services Committee Jan 2026	Methodology to identify ANDBC's anti-poverty levers across all council services has been developed and is currently being tested. Workshops will be used across all services areas to gather additional information. Final ratified minute sent to Community Planning Manager	Community Planning Manager	
700	Environment	10.12.25	Councillor Cochrane and councillor Thompson	That this Council notes the growing popularity of Linear Park in Bangor East as a hub for the local community. Further to this, officers will bring back a report exploring options for providing path markings in both Upper and Lower Linear Park for runners, such as distance indicators eg. 1 km, 2 km, along with appropriate signage to assist those who wish to keep fit in the Park. Officers will also examine options for upgrading the path and accompanying drainage system in Lower Linear Park between the bridge and the Ring Road, in light of persistent flooding and drainage issues.	Council January 2026 Environment Committee 04.02.26 Item 9.1	Report to be brought to September 2026 EC Assigned to February 2026 EC Agenda	Stephen Daye (Head of Parks and Cemeteries)	
706	Environment		Councillor Douglas and Alderman Cummings	To task officers to investigate and engage with other statutory agencies to work together to safely remove the fallen tree over the Enler River, Comber, which has been there since Storm Eowyn.	EC.04.03.26 Item 14.1 C.25.02.26 Item 15.2	Report to September 2026 EC NOM agreed at March 2026 EC Referred to EC at February 2026 Council	Stephen Daye (Head of Parks and Cemeteries)	
707	Environment	17.02.2026	Councillor Cochrane and Alderman Brooks	That this Council notes with deep concern the recent destruction caused to bushes, trees and wild grass in The Commons, Donaghadee. Further to this, Council agrees to write to the Minister of Agriculture, Environment and Rural Affairs, calling upon him to designate The Commons, Donaghadee as either an Area of Special Scientific Interest (ASSI), or another appropriate form of protected status, in order to help safeguard this important green space.	Council February 2026 Environment Committee 04.03.26 Item 14.2	Report to be brought to November 2026 EC Agreed at May 2026 EC to note the report and response from DAERA Council wrote to DfI 08.04.26 - response received 21.04.26 Agreed to adopt NOM at March 2026 EC Assigned to March 2026 EC Agenda	Stephen Daye (Head of Parks and Cemeteries)	
708	Corporate Services	18.02.2026 and amended sent 11.03.2026	Alderman Smith and Councillor Chambers	Council aims to reduce its level of rates increases in future years by introducing a zero based budgeting process, completing the ongoing review of planned capital expenditure and undertaking an in-depth engagement process with ratepayers/residents to explain our current strategy and to obtain feedback and input to the next rates process.	Council March 2026 Corporate Committee	Report update heard at June Corporate Committee. Remove from tracker after July Council	Head of Finance	To be removed following July Council meeting
709	Corporate Services	10.03.2026	Councillor McClean and Councillor Gilmour	That this Council, mindful of our close connections to the United States and our role in their history, commits to mark and celebrate the United States Semiquincentennial. Officers should consider options for events of different scales, including the theming of an existing event in the calendar, as well as exploring options to collaborate on an event of an appropriate level that complements the proposals of other councils (Causeway Coast and Glens, Antrim and Newtownabbey, Lisburn and Castlereagh) and would run in the latter half of this year.	Council March 2026 Corporate Committee	On Council agenda for July meeting.	Director of Corporate Services	

710	Place & Prosperity	11.03.2026	Councillor W Irvine and Councillor S Irvine	This Council commends the continued work and dedication of the South East Fermanagh Foundation (SEFF). For many years, the organisation has provided invaluable support, advocacy, and practical assistance to victims and survivors across Northern Ireland ensuring that their voices are heard and their needs are not forgotten. We agree to display the SEFF memorial quilt at a suitable location in the borough to honour innocent victims, educate the public about the impact of the Troubles, and ensure the legacy and memory of those lost continues to be recognised.	Council 25 March 2026 April Place & Prosperity Committee	Update report to October P&P 2026 Agreed at April P&P and ratified at April Council Ratified by March 2026 Council and referred to April P&P	Director of Place and Prosperity	Officers working with SEFF to identify a suitable date and location for mounting the quilt.
711	Active & Healthy Communities	13.03.2026	Alderman Cummings and Councillor Douglas	That this council recognises the Invictus Games, Birmingham 2027, a multi sports event, for wounded, injured and sick military service personnel, both serving and veterans, is being hosted in the UK for the first time since the inaugural games. Further, that we task officers to engage with Invictus Games to explore how we might facilitate additional training for Northern Ireland competitors in advance of the games, offering the best opportunity for local veterans and participants to attain the peak level of fitness, and to identify potential funding sources to assist in minimising the cost attributed to commuting to and from the mandatory national training camps, as required by all registered participants.	Council March 2026 Active and Healthy Communities Committee	Report to September 2026 A&HC Committee.	Anton Cozzo Head of Leisure	
713	Environment	17.03.2026	Councillor McCollum and Councillor Wray	That this Council notes the profound impact on the Clandeboy Community of the tragic death of 16 year old DICE leader and Army Cadet Jaidyn Rice on the 8th July 2025 and further notes the terrible loss of seven other lives on roads in our Borough during 2025, the highest of any Council area. Further that this Council tasks officers to work with the Rice family to create a bench honouring Jaidyn's contribution to her community, such bench to be a place of reflection, connection and outreach, in an agreed location and incorporating Council's Here to Help app for signposting to vital support services around the Borough.	Council March 2026 Environment Committee	Report to be brought to September 2026 EC NOM agreed at April 2026 EC Agreed to refer NOM to April 2026 EC	Stephen Daye (Head of Parks and Cemeteries)	
714	Environment	25.03.2026	Alderman Graham and Councillor Gilmour	Council notes the extension to the platform at Helen's Bay Station to enhance the safety of high numbers of visitors at peak times. To cope with such influxes of visitors, Council writes to Translink and requests that it provides toilet facilities at the railway station.	Council April 2026 Referred to Environment Committee May 2026	Update report to be brought to September 2026 EC CX Letter sent to Translink 05.06.26 - acknowledgement rec'd 08.06.26 Agreed at May 2026 EC Referred to EC at April 2026 Council	Graeme Bannister (Director of Environmental Services)	
715	Active & Healthy Communities	1.04.2026	Alderman McRandal and Councillor McCollum	This Council acknowledges that the decision taken in January 2026 to adopt Queen's community centre as the preferred site of the proposed Hollywood screen industries innovation hub has the potential to remove an important community asset from Hollywood. Council therefore resolves to undertake an exercise to assess the need for community space in Hollywood, with a report assessing need to be brought back to the relevant Committee.	Council April 2026 - Referred to Active & Healthy Communities Committee May 2026	Report to September 2026 A&HC Committee.	Arlene Barton (Head of Community and Culture)	
716	Environment	2.04.2026	Councillor Cochrane and Councillor Thompson	That this Council notes the need for adequate coastal defences and the ongoing issues affecting Donaghadee Harbour. Council further acknowledges the continued work and contribution of Donaghadee Sailing Club and Donaghadee Community Development Association in seeking solutions to these challenges. It further notes that significant engagement has already taken place with some public representatives and government bodies to this regard. Council therefore agrees to instruct officers to engage with counterparts in Dún Laoghaire-Rathdown County Council to explore the potential for Shared Island Funding as a means of supporting the delivery of necessary coastal defence infrastructure	Council April 2026 - Referred to Environment Committee May 2026	Update report to be brought to October 2026 EC Agreed at May 2026 EC Referred to EC at April 2026 Council	Peter Caldwell (Head of Estates)	

717	Planning	13.04.2026	Councillor Moore and Alderman McDowell	This Council notes the findings of the recent report presented to Planning Committee Members in March 2026 on wastewater capacity constraints, including the identification of closed catchments within parts of the Borough, the impact on planning and regeneration activity, and the wider challenges arising from longstanding underinvestment in wastewater infrastructure. Council further recognises that, while the report establishes the existence and significance of these constraints, further detailed evidence is required to fully understand the borough-wide impact and to support effective engagement with relevant agencies and the Department for Infrastructure, and to identify potential council-led solutions. Council agrees: •To task Council officers to prepare a detailed, borough-wide assessment identifying all locations affected by wastewater and sewage capacity constraints, including mapping of closed catchments, constrained wastewater treatment works and network limitations. •To quantify the impact of these constraints on Council priorities, including town centre regeneration, the Empty to Energised programme, business development, housing delivery and the non-domestic rate base. •To compile evidence, in consultation with the Northern Ireland Environment Agency and Northern Ireland Water, on the frequency and location of wastewater system failures, including out-of-sewer flooding and Unsatisfactory Discharges, and the associated environmental and ecological impacts across the Borough over the past ten years. •To write to SOLACE seeking information on how other councils are evidencing and responding to wastewater capacity constraints, including approaches taken in Belfast City Council, Newry, Mourne and Down, and Mid and East Antrim.	August Planning Committee 2026 May Planning Committee 2026 Council April 2026 - Referred to Planning Committee May 2026	Follow-up report to August Planning Committee advising that a cross party delegation met with DFI Minister. Response from Minister was put before Committee and agreed that Council writes back to the Minister objecting to the lack of infrastructure investment in the 2028–33 price control period. Council to ask Minister to review how granted but unbuilt planning permissions are considered, including differences between Councils. Council to seek confirmation that infrastructure investment will be prioritised to protect the future viability of town and urban centres. Amendment subject to ratification by August Council. Report went to May Planning re invite to meet with DFI Minister. Agreed and ratified by May Council.	Director of Place and Prosperity	
718	Corporate Services	14.04.2026	Councillor Morgan and Alderman McAlpine	That this council strongly condemns the blocking of the establishment of an Independent Environmental Protection Agency (IEPA) by the DUP in the Assembly and Executive; further condemns the hypocrisy of those who express concern over the Lough Neagh crisis, the illegal dump at Mobuoy and wider environmental degradation, but refuse to support plans to enhance environmental accountability and safeguards; notes that a commitment to an IEPA was contained within the New Decade, New Approach Deal; agrees that it is undemocratic for an IEPA to be unilaterally vetoed by one party which represents a minority in the Assembly as a whole; agrees to write to the Secretary of State for Northern Ireland to ask him to urgently convene a process of institutional reform, in consultation with the Irish Government and local parties, to remove blockages and vetoes from Stormont's system of government; and to ask the Secretary of State to take meaningful steps to ensure that commitments in New Decade, New Approach are implemented.	Council April 2026 - Referred to Corporate Services Committee May 2026			
719	Active & Healthy Communities	21.04.2026	Councillor McClean and Councillor Cathcart	That Council acknowledges the significant reduction in fixed penalty notices issued for dog fouling offences since the service was brought in-house; sets out the reasons for this performance and commits to an improvement plan; that this plan be reviewed in six months following its presentation; and that, following this review, considers any further options for improvement including different service model delivery. The improvement plan should seek as a minimum to achieve previous enforcement levels for FPNs issued, ensure cost control (including the option of penalty reductions for swift payment), drawing upon best practice elsewhere to include prevention and communication.	Council April 2026 - Referred to Active & Healthy Communities Committee May 2026	Report to November 2026 A&HC Committee.	Gareth Kinnear (Head of Environmental Health and Regulatory Services)	
720	Environment	24.04.2026	Councillor Edmund and Alderman Adair	That this Council task officers to bring forward a costed programme of works to bring slipways and harbours in Council ownership or control up to an appropriate standard in order that they can be utilised by leisure users as part of our wider tourism offering and to investigate appropriate funding streams to deliver this.	Council May 2026 referred to Environment Committee June 2026	Update report to be brought to future EC TBC Agreed at June 2026 EC Referred to EC at May 2026 Council	Peter Caldwell (Head of Estates)	
721	Environment	14.05.2026	Councillor W Irvine and Councillor S Irvine	This Council recognises the service and sacrifice of members of the Ulster Defence Regiment (UDR), including those from the Borough and surrounding areas who served with dedication during a difficult period in Northern Ireland's history. Accordingly, tasks officers to bring back a report this Council on providing a memorial bench within Clondeboy Cemetery, Bangor, dedicated to the memory and service of members of the Ulster Defence Regiment. The proposed bench should provide a dignified place for remembrance and reflection for families, veterans, and members of the wider community.	Council May 2026 referred to Environment Committee June 2026	Update report to be brought to future EC TBC Agreed at June 2026 EC Referred to EC at May 2026 Council	Stephen Daye (Head of Parks and Cemeteries)	
722	Corporate Services	17.05.2026	Councillor McBurney and Councillor McCollum	Following the deputation from pupils of Rathmore Primary School and Strangford College, which highlighted the importance of ensuring children and young people are included in decisions that affect them, this Council recognises that political literacy is fundamental to a healthy democracy and to preparing the next generation for active civic participation. Accordingly, Council requests that Officers bring forward a report setting out options for the development of a children's political literacy project to be delivered in advance of the May 2027 election, including, but not limited to: support available from the Electoral Commission; opportunities for Council to deliver the project alongside identified suitable partners; a workshop explaining how government works in Northern Ireland; and the organisation of a mock election to enable children and young people to express their views on the issues that matter most to them.	Council May 2026 - Referred to Corporate Services Committee June 2026	Agreed at June 2026 CS		

723	Active & Healthy Communities	18.05.2026	Councillor Wray and Councillor Newman	That this Council acknowledges increased demand for service experienced by North Down and Ards Women's Aid. Over the last three years referrals for floating support have increased by over 33% and referrals for refuge have increased by over 186%. This council is committed to the campaign of ending violence against women and girls, and to providing the best possible support service to victims, therefore officers will be tasked to: -Writes to the Minister for Communities requesting a review into the funding provided to Women's Aid through the Northern Ireland Housing Executive Supporting People Grant. -Writes to the Northern Ireland Executive welcoming the funding provided, but expressing concerns that the (EVAWG) programme is primarily resourced to support prevention activity, rather than provision of services. While investment in prevention is essential, it is already resulting in increased disclosures and referrals, particularly to Women's Aid services. The letter should also highlight the need for multiyear funding, and increased funding allocation for the Tier 3 EVAWG programme, which currently doesn't cover the cost of one additional member of staff. Secondly to letter should propose the establishment of a dedicated Emergency Fund in Northern Ireland to support women who are fleeing domestic abuse but face immediate financial barriers to accessing safety. Many women, particularly those who are working or have limited access to benefits, are unable to afford refuge accommodation costs or secure private rental housing due to high upfront expenses such as deposits and rent in advance. As a result, they are often forced to remain in unsafe environments or face homelessness. This fund would provide flexible, rapid financial assistance to cover emergency costs, refuge stays, and access to long-term housing, ensuring that no woman is prevented from leaving an abusive situation due to a lack of financial resources.	Council May 2026 - Referred to Active & Healthy Communities Committee June 2026	Agreed at June 2026 AHC		
724	Active & Healthy Communities		Councillors Cathcart and Gilmour	That this Council condemns recent anti-social behaviour witnessed in Bangor and the North Down coast and commits to reviewing our own resources, as well as working with relevant agencies to tackle this problem. Whilst grateful for police action taken, this Council recognises that the officers need additional powers to tackle anti-social behaviour and expresses disappointment that the Justice Minister has ruled out passing relevant legislation during this Assembly mandate. This Council therefore agrees to write to the Justice Minister, calling for action on anti-social behaviour legislation, more police officers for the Borough, the reopening of Bangor custody suite and the rejection of any lowering of the age of criminal responsibility.	Council - June 2026 - Referred to the Active and Healthy Communities Committee			
725	Environment		Councillor	That this Council notes the publication of NICCAP3 and recognises the need for practical measures to address	Council - June 2026	Tabled on September 2026 EC Agenda	Peter Caldwell (Head of Estates)	
726	Place & Prosperity		Alderman Smith and Councillor Chambers	That Council writes to the Department for Communities requesting a review of their current policy that stops businesses located outside of town centre core boundaries from applying for grant support.	Council - June 2026 - Referred to the Place and Prosperity	Added to Sept P&P agenda	Director of Place and Prosperity	
727	Active & Healthy Communities		Alderman McRandal and Councillor Harbinson	That this Council acknowledges the financial costs that it incurs in dealing with and disposing of litter and in seeking to take enforcement action. That this Council acknowledges that it needs to take further action to positively influence the attitude of some people towards littering. This Council therefore resolves to consider what additional actions it can reasonably take both to inform the public about the various harms that result from littering and to seek to change people's attitudes towards littering.	Council - June 2026 - Referred to the Active and Healthy Communities Committee			
728	Corporate Services		Councillor Brady and	That Council reverse its decision of 29th October 2025 to withdraw funding from the NAC NI Region and reinstates its membership, in line with the other ten councils in Northern Ireland.	Council - June 2026 - Referred to the			
729	Place & Prosperity	17.07.2026	Councillor Cathcart and McClean	That this Council recognises that our city, towns and villages in our Borough are a summer destination for many. Therefore the Council agrees to bring an officers' report back on reviving the annual 'Dressing Town' budget which was previously provided for banners and bunting and other decorative measures during the summer months. the aim of such a budget would be to provide visitors and residents with a summer welcome to our Borough, especially our seaside destinations.	Council - July 2026	Added to Sept P&P agenda	Director of Place and Prosperity	