

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

**Week Ending 13th December 2024**

<b>Item Number 1</b>			
<b>Application Reference</b>	LA05/2021/0057/F	<b>Date Valid</b>	12.01.2021
<b>Description of Proposal</b>	Retention of hard standing to be used as farmyard, new farm building and retention of access	<b>Location</b>	Lands at 2 Braithwaites Road Lisburn
<b>Group Recommendation</b>	Refusal	<b>Case Officer</b>	Catherine Gray
<b>Reasons for Recommendation</b>			
<p>The proposal is contrary to Policy COU1 of the Lisburn and Castlereagh City Council Plan Strategy 2032, in that the development in principle is not considered to be acceptable in the countryside nor will it contribute to the aim of sustainable development.</p> <p>The proposal is contrary to criteria (a) of Policy COU12 of the Lisburn and Castlereagh City Council Plan Strategy 2032, in that it has not been demonstrated that the agricultural business is currently active and established for a minimum of 6 years.</p> <p>The proposal is contrary to criteria (b) of Policy COU12 of the Lisburn and Castlereagh City Council Plan Strategy 2032, in that it has not been demonstrated that the proposal is necessary for the efficient use of the agricultural holding.</p> <p>The proposal is contrary to criteria (f) of Policy COU12 of the Lisburn and Castlereagh City Council Plan Strategy 2032, in that it has not been demonstrated that the proposal will not result in a detrimental impact on the amenity of residential dwellings outside the holding including potential problems arising from noise, smell and pollution.</p> <p>The proposal is contrary to criteria (f) of Policy COU16 of the Lisburn and Castlereagh City Council Plan Strategy 2032, in that it has not been demonstrated that the proposal would not adversely impact on residential amenity.</p> <p>The proposal is contrary to Policy WM2 of the Lisburn and Castlereagh City Council Plan Strategy 2032, in that the applicant has failed to demonstrate a solution for the treatment and disposal of wastewater and that this solution if approved would not create or add to a pollution problem.</p>			
<b>Representations</b>			
<b>Objection Letters</b>	<b>Support Letters</b>	<b>Objection Petitions</b>	<b>Support Petitions</b>
1	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>Consideration of Objections</b>			
<b>Issue</b>	<b>Consideration of Issue</b>		
Road safety.	The view is expressed that the road is unsuitable for heavy goods vehicles including farm vehicles.		

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

**Week Ending 13th December 2024**

	DfI Roads have been consulted and have raised no objections to the proposal.
View from 1 Braithwaites Road.	<p>The view is expressed that the proposal will be a skyline view from 1 Braithwaites Road.</p> <p>It is considered that the proposal would integrate sufficiently into the landscape and that the view from 1 Braithwaites Road would not be unacceptable.</p>

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

**Week Ending 13th December 2024**

<b>Item Number 2</b>			
<b>Application Reference</b>	LA05/2022/0541/F	<b>Date Valid</b>	31.05.2022
<b>Description of Proposal</b>	Non-compliance with condition 6 of LA05/2018/0952/F – existing dwelling to be demolished, together with amended sightlines.	<b>Location</b>	21 Crumlin Road, Ballinderry Upper, Lisburn
<b>Group Recommendation</b>	Approval	<b>Case Officer</b>	Catherine Gray
<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	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>Consideration of Objections</b>			
<b>Issue</b>	<b>Consideration of Issue</b>		
Planning history.	<p>The objector wishes to draw the Councils attention to the original permission and quotes the reasons for the original approval as per the case officer report.</p> <p>The planning history is a material consideration that has been taken on board through the processing of the application.</p>		
Removal of the original dwelling.	<p>The view is expressed that failure to ensure the removal of the original dwelling means that the requirements of policies CTY3 Replacement Dwellings, CTY8 Ribbon Development, CTY13 Integration and 14 Rural Character have not been met. The view is expressed that it is suggested that the dwelling being replaced has a negative visual impact on the rural character of the area and the proposal would in effect improve this position and that safety for the access is being improved, with both elements only satisfied with the removal of the existing dwelling. The view is also expressed that failure to ensure the condition is not complied with means that planning service has not satisfied the concerns of the objector.</p> <p>Each application is assessed on its own merits at the time of the application. The principle of the development of a replacement dwelling is not revisited through this planning application. PPS21 is no longer the prevailing planning policy for development in the countryside and is superseded by the Lisburn and Castlereagh City Council Plan Strategy 2032. The proposal has been assessed against policies within the Plan</p>		

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

**Week Ending 13th December 2024**

	<p>Strategy and DfI Roads have no objections to the access proposal. It is considered that this proposal would not cause any demonstrable harm.</p>
Unauthorised development.	<p>The view is expressed that the original consent and the currently existing permission have not been complied with.</p> <p>The Council is aware that the original planning approval has not been complied with in full. This application seeks to regularise the development.</p>
Principle of Development.	<p>The opinion is expressed that 'given this property needs to be demolished to satisfy the original planning approval perhaps the application needs to be considered as though it were not there and whether the current planning legislation would allow for its construction today'.</p> <p>The principle of development on the site is not re-visited through this application. The previous approval has been implemented. This application is in relation to the non-compliance of a condition attached to the original decision notice.</p>
Access.	<p>The view is expressed that 'the current proposal suggests the original access is being retained yet this has been identified as highly dangerous with no visibility, yet the current proposal continues to show the existing gate and entrance to the property that should have been closed up under the original planning approval'.</p> <p>This proposal seeks to amend the visibility splays from the previous approval to 2.4m by 93m to the southern side and 2.4m by 110m, while retaining the original access gateway as is on the ground. DfI Roads have been consulted and offer no objections to the proposal. It is considered that the proposal would not prejudice road safety or significantly inconvenience the flow of vehicles.</p>
Need for the retention of the building as a store.	<p>The view is expressed that 'there are currently no less than 5 buildings on the site in various state of repair, it is hard to see how any need for a further store could be demonstrated'.</p> <p>A need for the retention of the building does not need to be demonstrated. An original dwelling that has been replaced can be retained as long as it is not used as a habitable dwelling, for example used for storage purposes which is what this application proposes. If this proposal is approved then a condition would be placed on the decision notice that the building is not to be used for human habitation.</p>
Judicial review.	<p>The objector states that 'if planning service is minded to consider allowing this proposal to retain this building I advise that will most definitely seek a judicial review on the matter'.</p> <p>The application has been fully considered and assessed under the relevant policies. It is the right of an individual to pursue legal action if they wish to do so. This is not a material consideration that is given weight.</p>

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

**Week Ending 13th December 2024**

<b>Item Number 3</b>			
<b>Application Reference</b>	LA05/2021/1064/F	<b>Date Valid</b>	29.09.2021
<b>Description of Proposal</b>	Dwelling and garage	<b>Location</b>	Approximately 110 metres south of 76 Carnbane Road (formerly 81 Carnbane Road) Hillsborough, Lisburn
<b>Group Recommendation</b>	Refusal	<b>Case Officer</b>	Cara Breen
<b>Reasons for Recommendation</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The proposal is contrary to Policy COU1 of the Lisburn and Castlereagh City Council Plan Strategy, in that it is not a type of development which in principle is considered to be acceptable in the countryside.</li> <li>▪ The proposal is contrary to Policy COU8 of the Lisburn and Castlereagh City Council Plan Strategy, in that the proposed development would add to a ribbon of development along Carnbane Road.</li> <li>▪ The proposal is contrary to Criteria (f) and (g) of Policy COU15 of the Lisburn and Castlereagh City Council Plan Strategy, in that the design of the proposed dwelling and garage is inappropriate for the site and its locality, and the proposed ancillary works do not integrate with their surroundings.</li> <li>▪ The proposal is contrary to Criteria (c), (e) and (h) of Policy COU16 of the Lisburn and Castlereagh City Council Plan Strategy, in that the proposed development, if permitted, would not respect the traditional pattern of settlement exhibited in that area, result in an adverse impact on the rural character of the area and the impact of ancillary works would have an adverse impact on rural character.</li> </ul>			
<b>Representations</b>			
<b>Objection Letters</b>	<b>Support Letters</b>	<b>Objection Petitions</b>	<b>Support Petitions</b>
0	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>Consideration of Objections</b>			
<b>Issue</b>	<b>Consideration of Issue</b>		

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

**Week Ending 13th December 2024**

<b>Item Number 4</b>			
<b>Application Reference</b>	LA05/2020/0660/F	<b>Date Valid</b>	24.08.2020
<b>Description of Proposal</b>	Proposed dwelling and garage on farm	<b>Location</b>	150m northeast off 22 Knox Road, Dromore
<b>Group Recommendation</b>	Refusal	<b>Case Officer</b>	Helen McGuinness
<b>Reasons for Recommendation</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposal is contrary to Policy COU1 of the Lisburn and Castlereagh City Council Plan Strategy in that the proposed development is not a type of development which in principle is acceptable in the countryside.</li> <li>• The proposal is contrary to Policy COU10 of the Lisburn and Castlereagh City Council Plan Strategy in that it has not been demonstrated that the farm business is currently active and has been established for at least 6 years.</li> <li>• The proposal is contrary to criteria (i) of Policy COU16 of the Lisburn and Castlereagh City Council Plan Strategy in that it has not been demonstrated that the proposed development would not prejudice road safety or significantly inconvenience the flow of traffic.</li> <li>• The proposal is contrary to Policy TRA2 of the Lisburn and Castlereagh City Council Plan Strategy in that it has not been demonstrated that the proposed development would not prejudice road safety or significantly inconvenience the flow of vehicles.</li> </ul>			
<b>Representations</b>			
<b>Objection Letters</b>	<b>Support Letters</b>	<b>Objection Petitions</b>	<b>Support Petitions</b>
0	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>Consideration of Objections</b>			
<b>Issue</b>	<b>Consideration of Issue</b>		

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

**Week Ending 13th December 2024**

Item Number 5			
<b>Application Reference</b>	LA05/2022/0656/F	<b>Date Valid</b>	21.06.2022
<b>Description of Proposal</b>	Extension of curtilage to existing waste management facility for dry anaerobic digestion facility to process existing on-site material; new building for loading, dewatering building, 2no. digesters, CHP engine, flare, gas cleanup, digestate storage tank with balloon, stack (25m) grid injection point and all associated plant and other site works.	<b>Location</b>	Lands at and immediately west of existing in-vessel composting facility at Glenside Quarry 32 Glenside Road Dunmurry
<b>Group Recommendation</b>	Approval	<b>Case Officer</b>	Gillian Milligan
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>		
Concern contaminants entering nearby river. Site close to Slievenacloy ASSI and potential for waste material to blow into it and the countryside.	Water Management unit were consulted and are content there will be no adverse impact on the water environment on the basis that there is no liquid fertiliser (digestate) produced as a result of the proposed anaerobic digestion facility. Shared Environmental Service and Natural Environment Division were consulted regarding the impact on the adjacent ASSIs and are content that there are no likely adverse impacts on any designated site as the proposal will not generate any end-products and therefore no aerial emissions of ammonia and based on the site location and the existing drainage infrastructure there is no conceivable effects to any downstream designated sites.		
The site is within present day and climate change floodplain and	A Flood Risk and Drainage Assessment were provided which conclude that this development will not increase surface water flood risk at, or downstream of the site. DfI Rivers was consulted and offers no objections.		

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

**Week Ending 13th December 2024**

potential for flooding.	
Excessive and increased road traffic.	A Transport Assessment form was submitted which details that as the site tonnage is restricted to 175,000tpa by PPC(IE) Permit issued by DAERA there will be no increase in the overall amount of waste material or HGV traffic movements to/from the site as part of the proposed development and there will only be one additional member of staff which will not intensify the traffic movements.
Increased noise disturbance.	Noise Impact and Construction Noise Impact Assessments were submitted which demonstrate that noise levels at the nearest residential properties will not result in an exceedance of the daytime construction noise limit, the hours of construction will be restricted to daytime hours and best practice will be employed to minimise noise emissions and comply with the general recommendations of BS 5228 during the operational phase. Environmental Health were consulted and offer no objections subject to conditions to mitigate any potential adverse impacts on residential amenity.
Nuisance smells.	Odour Impact and Air Quality Impact Assessments were submitted which detail the change in modelled odour contributions from the proposal can be assessed as negligible at all receptors. Environmental Health were consulted and offer no objections subject to conditions to mitigate any potential adverse impacts on residential amenity.
Health and safety.	The site will be managed by separate legislation and best practice guidance to ensure health and safety on site.



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

**Week Ending 13th December 2024**

<b>Item Number 6</b>			
<b>Application Reference</b>	LA05/2022/0715/F	<b>Date Valid</b>	27.07.2022
<b>Description of Proposal</b>	Demolition of existing bakery buildings to rear of nos. 17-19 Main Street, Hillsborough. Internal demolition works to nos. 17 and 19 including the widening of the archway by removal and repositioning of the external wall to the entrance. Renovation and extension to the existing houses to provide 3 number guest apartments, 3 no. guest houses and off-street parking with all associated site works	<b>Location</b>	17-19 Main Street, Hillsborough
<b>Group Recommendation</b>	Approval	<b>Case Officer</b>	Brenda Ferguson
<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>
75	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>Consideration of Objections</b>			
<b>Issue</b>	<b>Consideration of Issue</b>		
The proposed extension is too high and the arrangement in terms of the basement car parking is misleading as it is not subterranean.	The proposal has been considered taking cognisance of the existing levels. The new build to the rear has been redesigned in comparison to the original scheme submitted. The basement level to the rear will be sub ground floor level therefore the new build does not read visually as 3 storeys. The guest accommodation is two stories as you go further back into the site. The extension is deemed to be acceptable in terms of its height and will not be visible from several viewpoints in particular Main Street.		

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

**Week Ending 13th December 2024**

<p>3 stories are too high in this sensitive area.</p>	<p>As above, the height of the extension is deemed to be suitable and is proportional in relation to the host buildings.</p>
<p>Scale and massing are not acceptable. The dominant extension on the Hillside should not be justification to hide another.</p>	<p>It is considered that the scale and massing of the development is of an appropriate scale and in keeping with the built form in the area. The roof level is no higher than the eaves levels of the adjacent listed building, no. 21-23 Main Street and the back portion of the proposal steps down to two storeys thus reducing the overall massing as the development goes further back into the site. The mansard roof with the new build extension seeks to ensure the back land development does not dominate the buildings to the front, nos. 17 and 19.</p>
<p>Intensification and overdevelopment of site.</p>	<p>As detailed above, the proposal is deemed to be acceptable in terms of its scale, size, massing and height. The Council are satisfied that the proposed new built will not result in overdevelopment.</p>
<p>Extension should be subordinate and more in keeping with the stone coach house vernacular style buildings that are behind other houses.</p>	<p>The extension is considered to be subordinate in terms of its scale, size, height and massing</p>
<p>Existing stone buildings are much smaller in size, form and mass than what the new build will be. Footprint is not similar as it is one large extension spanning 3 floors.</p>	<p>The new build is said to be proportionate in terms of its size, scale, height and footprint. The built form is comparable to the existing built footprint. The increase in height of the new build is considered acceptable and the drawings provided in support of the application demonstrate that the new build will not cause overdominance to the neighbouring buildings and views of the extension into and out of the Conservation Area are restricted.</p>
<p>A successful and desirable restoration of the bakery buildings can be achieved like that the one at no. 9 Main Street.</p>	<p>A structural survey was undertaken of the old buildings which deemed that the two-storey bakery building is incapable of being retained and incorporated into the overall scheme as per the structural report. A suitable redevelopment scheme is proposed and meets policy requirements.</p>
<p>Light pollution and impact on wildlife.</p>	<p>NED have concluded that the proposal will not adversely affect features of natural heritage importance subject to conditions. No concerns in respect of light pollution have been identified by NED.</p>

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

**Week Ending 13th December 2024**

Excessive brick in the design.	It is considered that the proposed use of the materials is reflective of the existing buildings on site and takes cognisance of the local architecture in terms of materials and finishes.
The mansard roof is not in keeping with the historic conservation area.	The roof style and design has been revised to natural slate pitched roof in parts of the new build to be more in keeping with the surrounding back land developments.
PVC windows not in keeping with CA.	No PVC windows are proposed. These have been amended to hardwood timber in keeping with CA guidance.
High level windows overlooking into private gardens, patios and other living accommodation.	The proposal will not harm the amenities of nearby residents. The scheme has been designed in such a way as to minimise overlooking into nearby private amenity areas. The location, positioning and orientation of the side guest accommodation windows and balconies along with the separation distance to the common boundaries will ensure that no overlooking, loss of light or overdominance will occur and the proposal will not have an unacceptable adverse effect on the nearby properties. Criteria (h) is met.
Noise pollution due to increase in traffic.	DFI Roads are content with the proposal and have identified no concerns. Environmental Health have no concerns from a noise perspective.
Commercial use will negatively impact on the village.	The proposed tourism use is deemed to be acceptable and meets the policy requirements of Policies TOU1 and TOU7.
Widening of the archway from 2.5-2.8m is unprecedented in a historic royal village. This will disrupt the shape of the arch and disturb the historic fabric.	The widening of the archway in terms of the impact on the views into and out of the Conservation Area has been fully considered. The widening of 30cm is minimal and will not visually disrupt the proportions along this street frontage. It is also considered that the changes to the front elevations of properties 17 and 19 present a betterment in terms of the fenestration with the vertical emphasis on the window openings which will replicate the existing street rhythm and enhance the appearance along the street frontage.
Removal of old yew tree and concern for more trees needing to be removed without replacement.	The proposed block plan shows the removal of an existing tree within the site to facilitate the proposed extension. The remainder of the extant vegetation within the site is noted as retained. NED welcomes the retention of other extant trees and recommends that vegetative clearance is kept to a minimum, with adequate compensation planting of native species mitigating for loss of any biodiversity.

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

**Week Ending 13th December 2024**

Management of drainage/sewage disposal.	NI Water and the applicant have agreed a downstream engineering solution to mitigate the foul capacity issue and allow connection for this development proposal. This solution is to be fully funded and delivered by the applicant. NI Water are content to approve subject to conditions. Water Management Unit have raised no concerns in respect of the means of sewage disposal. It is considered the proposal complies with Policy WM2
Design of arches for car parking not in style with CA and will result in destruction of the Georgian proportions.	The widening of the archway in terms of the impact on the views into and out of the Conservation Area has been fully considered. The widening of 30cm is minimal and will not visually disrupt the proportions along this street frontage. It is also considered that the changes to the front elevations of properties 17 and 19 present a betterment in terms of the fenestration with the vertical emphasis on the window openings which will replicate the existing street rhythm and enhance the appearance along the street frontage.
Concerns relating to exiting of vehicles from archway onto main road.	In consideration of Policy TRA 2, vehicular access to the site is via the existing archway which is to be widened to 2.8m to facilitate a safe and convenient access onto Main Street.  DFI Roads are content with the information and drawings provided in support of the application and proposed access arrangements and advise that they have no objections subject to conditions
Proposal contrary to Policy HE10 of Plan Strategy.	It is concluded that that the proposal fully complies with the criteria as set out within Policy HE10 and the new development will preserve the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. The requirements of Policy HE10 are met.
Query as to why the building is not listed due to historic features and heritage.	HED Historic Buildings have identified a number of listed buildings adjacent to the site and within the vicinity however nos. 17 and 19 are not listed. Nonetheless, there are only minimal alterations by way of changes to the front elevations of these properties which HED considered to be a betterment on the setting of the listed buildings on Main Street.
Public car park sufficient to accommodate guests parking.	It is proposed to provide off street parking to facilitate the development. The spaces have been provided having regard to the Department's published parking standards which takes account of the site characteristics and location within Royal Hillsborough Town Centre. DFI Roads are satisfied with the detail provided in respect of the parking.
Points raised by Conservation officer have not been addressed.	The proposal has been fully considered taking on board the advice provided by the Conservation Officer. It is contended that the proposal complies with policy and will preserve the character of the Hillsborough Conservation Area.