

Divisional Planning Office
Bedford House
Bedford Street
Belfast
BT2 7FD

Date: _____

Dear Sir

I am writing to formally object to the below application.

TESCO PLANNING APPLICATION. U/2007/0153 Received 22 March 2007

**Proposed Superstore, adjacent retail units, petrol filling station, car park, landscaping and access works.
Lands at former Spinning Mill (FG Wilson), 36 Hillhead Road, Ballyclare.**

Detail

Size of site 3.77 hectares

Proposed superstore 7,463 sq metres gross (approx 75,000 sq ft)

I am writing to formally object to the above application.

Grounds for objection

- The site is located outside the Town Centre for Ballyclare as designated in the draft Belfast Metropolitan Area Plan (BMAP) 2015 and is situated on the edge of the development limits for the town and is contrary to the plan's retail proposals.
- The proposal is also contrary to Policy PPS5-Retailing and Town Centres as it does not comply with paragraphs 39,41 and 60 of the policy. The proposal will have a detrimental impact on the vitality and viability of Ballyclare town centre and will lead to its decline.
- The site is zoned as a major area of industrial land (BE 10) in the draft BMAP, which is currently under examination at the public inquiry. The proposal is contrary to the plan proposals and would be premature until the draft plan is finalised as it would lead to a shortage of industrial land.
- The proposal will generate a substantial increase in traffic on the surrounding roads and in particular the main Larne to Templepatrick (A57) road, which is a Protected Route. The proposal will conflict with the aims of protected routes as set down in PPS3-Access, Movement and Parking.
- The proposal will have a detrimental impact on the amenity of the adjoining residential properties, which abut the site at the Beechfield and Hillview Drive developments. The impacts will include noise and nuisance from service delivery vehicles and vehicle parking, floodlighting and security lighting every day of the week from early morning to late evening.
- Although the DOE has determined that no Environmental Impact Statement is required this has been based on only two impacts of noise and visual amenity. It is felt that DOE has erred in its determination and that an EIA is required to examine alternative sites, the potential impact on the town centre and the possible contamination of the site from former industrial use. In addition no noise report has been sought by DOE in order to assess the noise impact. An EIA should now be sought to cover these potential impacts.

Yours Faithfully,