

# List of delegated planning applications with objections received / recommendation to refuse

**Week Ending 12th June 2026**

Item Number 1			
<b>Application Reference</b>	LA05/2025/0046/O	<b>Date Valid</b>	16.01.2025
<b>Description of Proposal</b>	Proposed dwelling on a farm in compliance with Policy COU10	<b>Location</b>	North and adjacent to 32 Lisdoonan Road, Lisdoonan, Saintfield
<b>Group Recommendation</b>	Approval	<b>Case Officer</b>	Kevin Maguire
Reasons for Recommendation			
All relevant planning material considerations have been satisfied.			
Representations			
<b>Objection Letters</b>	<b>Support Letters</b>	<b>Objection Petitions</b>	<b>Support Petitions</b>
1	N/A	N/A	N/A
Consideration of Objections			
<b>Issue</b>	<b>Consideration of Issue</b>		
Principle of development in open countryside.	The application has been applied for as a farm dwelling and has been deemed acceptable in principle and in accordance with Policy COU10 of the LCCC Plan Strategy.		
Additional traffic.	The application is for a single house and the additional traffic would be limited. DfI Roads have been consulted and are content with the proposals subject to conditions.		
Visual impact.	It is determined that the development would be set back from both the Lisdoonan Road and Beechmount Road, and at a lower level than the land and the dwelling at No 32 to the south. An appropriately scaled dwelling on the site is unlikely to result in adverse visual impact from public vantage points.		
Late receipt of neighbour notification letter.	No recommendation has been made on this application until much later than the statutory expiration date for neighbour notification, therefore there is no prejudice to any third parties and an appropriate amount of time for comment has been provided.		
No details given on orientation and size of proposed dwelling	The application seeks outline planning permission. An indicative site plan indicating orientation towards Beechmount Road has been submitted however this is for information purposes only and any siting would be agreed at reserved matter stage.		

## List of delegated planning applications with objections received / recommendation to refuse

**Week Ending 12th June 2026**

Item Number 2			
<b>Application Reference</b>	LA05/2025/0791/F	<b>Date Valid</b>	05.11.2025
<b>Description of Proposal</b>	Retention of replacement new build shed and associated hardstanding ancillary to the main dwelling; curtilage extension; proposed new boundary fence with native species hedge.	<b>Location</b>	22 Halfpenny Gate Road, Moira, Craigavon
<b>Group Recommendation</b>	Approval	<b>Case Officer</b>	Kevin Maguire
Reasons for Recommendation			
All relevant planning material considerations have been satisfied.			
Representations			
<b>Objection Letters</b>	<b>Support Letters</b>	<b>Objection Petitions</b>	<b>Support Petitions</b>
3	N/A	N/A	N/A
Consideration of Objections			
<b>Issue</b>	<b>Consideration of Issue</b>		
Concerns that curtilage extension will be used to build additional sheds/houses.	Each application is considered on its own merits. The current application in front of the Council relates to a single shed and curtilage extension. Should any further sheds or other structures be built on the site these may be subject to planning control or enforcement if built without the necessary permission.		
Shed will be used for business.	The information submitted with the application indicates that the proposal will be used for domestic purposes only. This appears to correspond with the vehicles and itinerary of equipment provided in support of the application, which have been verified through site visit. A condition would be added to any approval restricting this use to domestic purposes only.		
Concerns regarding use of site and adjoining field for alternative uses.	The application requests the retrospective approval of shed and extension to curtilage for domestic purposes only. Any other use of the site for alternative purposes including use of the field to the rear outside of the site would not be permitted under this application and may be subject to an enforcement investigation.		
Impact/loss of trees and hedging.	At the time of site visit the curtilage has been extended and shed has been built. From Google Earth images it appears that a portion of the western hedge has been removed to accommodate the shed, and there may have been some hedging to the rear boundary however		

## List of delegated planning applications with objections received / recommendation to refuse

**Week Ending 12th June 2026**

	compensatory planting is proposed at this location and is considered acceptable.
Previous commercial activities have impacted amenity of existing residents and road safety concerns.	As noted, the proposal relates to a domestic extension to the curtilage and domestic shed. Previous commercial activities at the site do not form part of this current planning application. It is not envisaged that use of the site for the development applied for would not result in unacceptable impact or concerns relating to roads safety.
Concerns regarding extension of curtilage and scale/size of shed is not in keeping with domestic purposes.	While the shed is large in comparison with the existing dwelling on site, the extension of curtilage, its position set back from the road and existing screening is considered in context with the scale of neighbouring development. The use of relatively simple design and materials is considered to not adversely impact on the existing property or character of the immediate area. The applicant has provided sufficient detail to demonstrate that the storage capacity of the shed is needed for the property and the use is for domestic purposes only.

# List of delegated planning applications with objections received / recommendation to refuse

**Week Ending 12th June 2026**

<b>Item Number 3</b>			
<b>Application Reference</b>	LA05/2025/0177/F	<b>Date Valid</b>	14.03.2025
<b>Description of Proposal</b>	Erection of steel framed structure with a stretched outer skin and retractable sides over the existing two tennis courts	<b>Location</b>	160 metres northwest of 21 Old Coach Road, Royal Hillsborough
<b>Group Recommendation</b>	Approval	<b>Case Officer</b>	Sinead McCloskey
<b>Reasons for Recommendation</b>			
All relevant planning material considerations have been satisfied.			
<b>Representations</b>			
<b>Objection Letters</b>	<b>Support Letters</b>	<b>Objection Petitions</b>	<b>Support Petitions</b>
2	1	N/A	N/A
<b>Consideration of Objections</b>			
<b>Issue</b>	<b>Consideration of Issue</b>		
Permanent structure would be visually intrusive development on an elevated site – at odds with the surrounding landscape. The original dome and proposed new dwelling were not, and are not, sympathetic to the surrounding environment in terms of siting, size, and landscape treatment.	A seasonal dome was approved on this site. Sufficient supporting information was provided to justify the need for a more permanent structure. In light of the planning history and the supporting information the proposal is deemed acceptable. It is thought that the proposed structure will have no greater impact than the existing dome when erected. It will be smaller in height and has retractable sides which will reduce the overall visual impact by allowing uninterrupted views across all sides of the courts. The site is also seen to be at a lower level than the road. The original dome gained planning permission in 2012, and this permission has been enacted. No dwelling has been proposed with this application.		
Industrial nature of a steel framed building would detract from the character of	The proposed structure is smaller than the existing dome, by over 2m in height. It will occupy the same footprint, extending no further into the countryside. It will therefore have no greater visual impact than the existing dome when erect. It is covered in a stretched fabric outer skin which will not give the appearance of an industrial building. It has		

## List of delegated planning applications with objections received / recommendation to refuse

**Week Ending 12th June 2026**

<p>greenbelt area and would be visible from multiple vantage points – including the Hillsborough Monument - visual impact of the development would compromise the setting of the monument and detract from the visitor experience.</p>	<p>retractable sides which will reduce the overall visual impact by allowing uninterrupted views across all sides of the courts. The site is not located within an area of historical or archaeological constraint as identified, so consultation with Historic Environment was not necessary.</p>
<p>Landscaping works and conditions have never been completed from original permission.</p>	<p>A landscape plan has been submitted and will be conditioned in the decision notice. If this is not completed as per the conditions attached to the decision notice, enforcement action may be taken.</p>
<p>No effort has been made by the Club to make the existing dome more visually sympathetic to the area.</p>	<p>The existing dome is damaged and will no longer be in use. It is thought that the proposal has been designed to be sympathetic to the countryside location as it is lower in height than the approved dome and will have retractable sides to assist with the integration of the structure into this area.</p>
<p>Local residents have not been consulted or considered throughout these proposals.</p>	<p>Appropriate neighbour notification has been carried out in accordance with the legislation. There is no requirement for the applicant to consult with local residents for an application of this nature.</p>
<p>Tennis is an outdoor sport - the current dome is unsuitable during winter months - necessity and justification for a permanent enclosure.</p>	<p>A robust supporting statement has been submitted with the application to explain why a more permanent structure is required. This has been reviewed and deemed acceptable.</p>
<p>Impact on wildlife - since the removal of the dome return of foxes, red kites and long eared barn owls.</p>	<p>A biodiversity checklist and ecological statement have been submitted with the application and it is concluded in the assessment that the development is unlikely to have a significant impact on any protected or priority species or habitats.</p>

## **List of delegated planning applications with objections received / recommendation to refuse**

**Week Ending 12th June 2026**

<p>Unacceptable impact on level of traffic. Monument Road often experiences significant flooding from the fields nearby which is also hazardous to residents and club members travelling by car.</p>	<p>It was confirmed by DFI Roads through informal discussions that a consultation was not necessary as more cars attending the site per year is not an intensification of the use (an increase in cars at the site per day is an intensification of the use). As such there are no concerns regarding traffic and road safety. DFI Rivers were consulted but raised no concerns with regard to this application.</p>
--	--

# List of delegated planning applications with objections received / recommendation to refuse

**Week Ending 12th June 2026**

<b>Item Number 4</b>			
<b>Application Reference</b>	LA05/2025/0747/F	<b>Date Valid</b>	15.10.2025
<b>Description of Proposal</b>	Proposed replacement of existing Army/Air Cadet premises to provide new single storey Army/Air Cadet building, vehicular access from Wallace Avenue, pedestrian access from Conway Street, car parking including 2 no. EV charging stations, roof mounted solar photovoltaic panels, security fencing, and all associated infrastructure and site works.	<b>Location</b>	Lands at 25 Wallace Avenue and 4a Conway Street, Lisburn
<b>Group Recommendation</b>	Approval	<b>Case Officer</b>	Adam Mitchell
<b>Reasons for Recommendation</b>			
All relevant planning material considerations have been satisfied.			
<b>Representations</b>			
<b>Objection Letters</b>	<b>Support Letters</b>	<b>Objection Petitions</b>	<b>Support Petitions</b>
3	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>Consideration of Objections</b>			
<b>Issue</b>	<b>Consideration of Issue</b>		
Overlooking/loss of privacy.	<p>Plans show the classroom in close proximity to a primary private garden of No. 8 &amp; 10 Conway Street. Therefore, concerns with window placement and orientation could potentially result in direct line of sight or unacceptable overlooking.</p> <p>The closest properties adjacent to the northern shared boundary are No. 8 and 10 Conway Street. The northern facing elevation includes five additional windows serving two toilets, a changing area, a tea and coffee area, and a classroom. The proposed windows serving the toilets and changing area will be obscurely glazed to uphold the privacy of the occupiers and neighbouring residents.</p> <p>Revised site plan ref. 02C and Cross Sections Plans ref. 06A confirm that a 2.4 meter-high close-boarded timber fence will be erected along a 6-</p>		

## List of delegated planning applications with objections received / recommendation to refuse

**Week Ending 12th June 2026**

	<p>metre section of the northern boundary. This additional boundary treatment will further restrict direct lines of sight from the classroom window towards the rear gardens of the neighbouring residential properties, thereby enhancing the protection of the residential amenity of No.8 Conway Street's private garden.</p> <p>Further, views from the adjacent tea point room will be largely screened by the existing boundary and vegetation on top of the stone wall. As such no significant overlooking or loss of privacy is anticipated from these rear-facing windows.</p> <p>Having regard to the proposed glazing specification and enhanced boundary treatment, it is not considered that the development would give rise to any unacceptable adverse impacts on neighbouring properties. It is also noted that no additional representations were received following the publication of the revised plans to the Planning Portal.</p>
<p>Proposed building is a significant increase in size close to the rear boundary therefore raising concerns with privacy and safeguarding issues.</p>	<p>The proposed replacement building measures approx. 315 square meters compared to the existing northern building measuring 94 square meters. It is considered that the application site is large enough for the proposed building to fit seamlessly into the site and given the single storey form would not create a dominant structure within the local area. Additionally, for the reasons outlined above, the proposed development would not contribute additional privacy or loss of light concerns for the closest residential properties to the north of the application site.</p> <p>In terms of residential amenity and overlooking, the closest properties adjacent to the northern shared boundary are No. 8 and 10 Conway Street. The northern facing elevation includes five additional windows serving two toilets, a changing area, a tea and coffee area, and a classroom. The proposed windows serving the toilets and changing area will be obscurely glazed to uphold the privacy of the occupiers and neighbouring residents. A 2.4 meter-high close-boarded timber fence will be erected along a 6-metre section of the northern boundary. This additional boundary treatment will further restrict direct lines of sight from the classroom window towards the rear gardens of the neighbouring residential properties.</p>
<p>Vehicle Access</p>	<p>Relocation to Wallace Avenue is a positive development alleviating on street car parking pressures on Conway Street. Conway Street on-site parking could be negatively impacted by construction and plant machinery parking.</p> <p>The proposal includes the provision of a new vehicular access via Wallace Avenue as outlined in Site Plan ref. 02C, together with enhanced on-site parking arrangements. It is acknowledged that, during the construction phase, there may be a temporary requirement for construction and plant machinery parking, which could result in some</p>

## List of delegated planning applications with objections received / recommendation to refuse

**Week Ending 12th June 2026**

	<p>short-term disruption. However, this is not considered to represent a permanent impact.</p> <p>A representation outlined above, raises concerns regarding potential pressure on on-street parking along Conway Street during construction. It is also noted within the representation that the relocation of access to Wallace Avenue is viewed positively, as it has the potential to alleviate existing on-street pressure along Conway Street.</p> <p>On balance, while some temporary inconvenience may arise during the construction phase, the proposed access arrangement and improved on-site parking provision are considered to result in an overall beneficial impact on parking and vehicle access in the area. Additionally, after reviewing the proposed plans DFI Roads had no objections subject to conditions attached to any approval.</p>
Boundary Treatment.	<p>Incorporating new planting within the application site is a positive replacement and will enhance the visual landscape and biodiversity of the street scene.</p> <p>Existing boundary fence attached to the application site if damaged or demolished should be reinstated or replaced to a comparable standard at no additional cost to the occupier. Should be taken into account during any subsequent construction works.</p> <p>Concerns surrounding damages to existing boundary wall with No.8 and No.10 Conway Street.</p> <p>The revised site plan ref.02C confirms that a 3-metre-high metal mesh fence will be erected along the application site boundaries. This, alongside the proposed soft landscaping, is considered to provide an appropriate and secure boundary treatment. Any works affecting boundary structures outside the scope of the approved plans would not be authorised and could constitute a breach of planning control, subject to enforcement action. Matters relating to potential damage during construction are considered to be addressed through separate legal or civil matters.</p> <p>On balance, the proposed boundary treatment and landscaping are considered acceptable and would not give rise to adverse impacts on neighbouring properties.</p>
Neighbour Notification.	<p>Notification letter stipulating a comment was dated 7<sup>th</sup> November was not received until 10<sup>th</sup> November.</p> <p>Renotification letter dated 27<sup>th</sup> January but only received on the 9<sup>th</sup> February 2026.</p> <p>The Planning Authority confirms that neighbour notification and re-notification were carried out in accordance with statutory requirements as part of the application process. While postal delivery times are outside the</p>



# List of delegated planning applications with objections received / recommendation to refuse

**Week Ending 12th June 2026**

	<p>control of the Planning Authority, it is noted that sufficient time was afforded for representations to be made.</p> <p>As such, it is not considered that any procedural irregularity has occurred that would prejudice the determination of the application.</p>
--	---