

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

Week Ending 15th August 2025

Item Number 1			
Application Reference	LA05/2023/0965/F	Date Valid	05.12.2023
Description of Proposal	Extension to rear and side of shop to provide storage area and extension to front of premises to provide outdoor covered storage area (Retrospective)	Location	18 Rathfriland Road, Dromara
Group Recommendation	Refusal	Case Officer	Emma Forde
Reasons for Recommendation			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The development is contrary to paragraph 4.11 and 4.12 of the Strategic Planning Policy Statement for Northern Ireland (SPPS) in that the layout and design of the proposal would result in general nuisance, loss of light and overshadowing to the adjacent residential dwelling. 			
Representations			
Objection Letters	Support Letters	Objection Petitions	Support Petitions
2	N/A	N/A	N/A
Consideration of Objections			
Issue	Consideration of Issue		
The front extension is not permitted development.	Permission is sought for this extension under this application.		
Overlooking and loss of privacy.	The application is considered to result in a harmful level of overlooking and loss of light to No.16. As such, the application is recommended as a refusal.		
Reduction in parking.	Given that the extensions would be used for storage, this will not result in any extra traffic and would not require any amendments to the access, or additional parking. The front section of the site appears to be used for parking. To ensure the development would not result in adverse effects in relation to parking or access DfI Roads were consulted on the application. DfI Roads have no objections to the development.		
The existing materials of the front façade are incorrect on the submitted existing plans.	It is noted that there are no materials stated on the submitted existing plans.		

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

Week Ending 15th August 2025

The front elevation has been changed, and the finishes are not in keeping with the existing building or surrounding area.	The application includes the change of material on the front elevation to black cladding. While this material is not common in the area, the site is not within a Conservation Area, and the material is considered to give the building a more contemporary appearance. There are black wooden features in the surrounding area which this would be in keeping with. It is noted that more contemporary materials are also present on the local Eurospar located near the site.
Advertisements and a tin shed have been added on the site which impacts the neighbour's amenity.	Given that the advertisements would require a separate application, these have not been considered under this application. Likewise, the 'tin shed' has not been applied for under this application and so has not been considered in this assessment and would therefore require a further application to be submitted.
Concerns regarding fire safety and water running onto the neighbouring properties.	These are not considered to be planning matters and so have not been considered under this application.

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

Week Ending 15th August 2025

Item Number 2			
Application Reference	LA05/2024/0147/O	Date Valid	23.02.2024
Description of Proposal	2 no. 2-storey infill dwellings	Location	Lands between 247 and 251 Hillhall Road, Hillhall, Lisburn
Group Recommendation	Refusal	Case Officer	Cara Breen
Reasons for Recommendation			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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. ▪ The proposal is contrary to Policy COU8 of the Lisburn and Castlereagh City Council Plan Strategy, in that there is not a small gap, sufficient to accommodate two dwellings within an otherwise substantial and continuously built up frontage. Furthermore, the proposed development would not be appropriate to the existing plot size and width. The development, if approved, would add to a ribbon of development along Hillhall Road. ▪ The proposal is contrary to Criterion (c) and (e) of Policy COU16 of the Lisburn and Castlereagh City Council Plan Strategy, in that the proposed development would, if permitted, not respect the traditional pattern of settlement exhibited in that area and it would have an adverse impact on the rural character of the area. ▪ The proposal is contrary to Policy NH1 of the Lisburn and Castlereagh City Council Plan Strategy, in that it has not been demonstrated that the development proposal is not likely to have a significant effect on a European Site or a listed or proposed Ramsar Site. ▪ The proposal is contrary to Policy NH2 of the Lisburn and Castlereagh City Council Plan Strategy, in that it has not been demonstrated that the development proposal is not likely to harm a species protected by law. ▪ The proposal is contrary to Policy NH5 of the Lisburn and Castlereagh City Council Plan Strategy, in that it has not been demonstrated that the development proposal is not likely to result in the unacceptable adverse impact on, or damage to habitats, species or features of natural heritage importance. 			
Representations			
Objection Letters	Support Letters	Objection Petitions	Support Petitions
11	N/A	N/A	N/A

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

Week Ending 15th August 2025

Consideration of Objections	
Issue	Consideration of Issue
Approval would contradict the previous decision on infill policy on the site.	The Council are aware that the application site was previously subject to Planning approval under LA05/2016/0676/F for one infill dwelling as part of a proposal for two infill dwellings, one of which has been built and is now known as No. 247 Hillhall Road. As per refusal reason 2, it is not considered that the application site constitutes a small gap, sufficient to accommodate 2 dwellings within an otherwise substantial and continuously built-up frontage. Furthermore, the development would not be appropriate to the existing plot size and width and the development would add to a ribbon of development along Hillhall Road.
It would create urban sprawl/mar the distinction between the rural area and urban settlement.	It is considered that the proposed scheme is located a sufficient distance away from the defined settlement limit of Hillhall that if it meets the Exceptions Test of Policy COU8 of the Lisburn and Castlereagh City Council Plan Strategy that it would not create urban sprawl or mar the distinction between the rural area and urban settlement.
It would create ribbon development.	As per refusal reason 2, it is considered that the proposed development would add to a ribbon of development along Hillhall Road.
Application site created by the applicant by only erecting 1 of the previously approved 2 infill dwellings.	The Council are aware that the application site was previously subject to Planning approval under LA05/2016/0676/F for one infill dwelling as part of a proposal for two infill dwellings, one of which has been built and is now known as No. 247 Hillhall Road. As per refusal reason 2, it is not considered that the application site constitutes a small gap, sufficient to accommodate 2 dwellings within an otherwise substantial and continuously built-up frontage and furthermore, the development would not be appropriate to the existing plot size and width. The proposed development would add to a ribbon of development along Hillhall Road.
It would not respect the existing pattern of development.	As per refusal reason 2, it is contended that the proposal would not respect the existing pattern of development in terms of, plot size and width.
It would create a suburban style sweeping driveway.	Taking the nature of the proposed vehicular access into account in the context of the immediate vicinity and the nature of the application site, there are no concerns in relation to the proposed driveway
2 dwellings as opposed to one would be a prominent feature in the landscape.	Taking the topography of the application site, which sits at a lower level to Hillhall Road, the size and ground level of neighbouring buildings, the existing mature vegetation in the area and the existing road trajectory into account, it is considered that two dwellings of an appropriate ridge height could be accommodated on the application site without appearing as a prominent feature in the landscape.

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

Week Ending 15th August 2025

Contrary to Policy NH6 of the Lisburn and Castlereagh City Council Plan Strategy in that the siting and scale is not sympathetic to Lagan Valley Regional Park Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.	As per the Concept Plan, the proposed dwellings would follow a building line akin to that of the existing buildings in situ at No. 245, No. 247 and No. 251 Hillhall Road. Whilst it is acknowledged that the proposed dwellings would be smaller in scale to the existing buildings in the frontage they are not considered to be unsympathetic to Lagan Valley Regional Park Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.
Contrary to Policy TRA3 of Lisburn and Castlereagh City Council Plan Strategy in that it would create an intensification of an access onto a Protected Route.	DfI Roads were consulted as part of the processing of the application. In their final consultation response, dated 3 rd May 2024, DfI Roads offer no concern in relation to the proposal, subject to the inclusion of 4no. stipulated conditions, as per their consultation response, with any approval.
Contrary to Policy FLD3 of the Lisburn and Castlereagh City Council Plan Strategy.	DfI Rivers were consulted as part of the processing of the application. In their final consultation response, dated 3 rd July 2025, DfI Rivers offer no objection to the proposed scheme insofar as it relates to Policy FLD3 of the Lisburn and Castlereagh City Council Plan Strategy.
Contrary to Policy FLD4 of the Lisburn and Castlereagh City Council Plan Strategy.	DfI Rivers were consulted as part of the processing of the application. In their final consultation response, dated 3 rd July 2025, DfI Rivers note that Policy FLD4 is not applicable in this instance based on the information provided.
Contrary to Policy NH2 and NH5 of the Lisburn and Castlereagh City Council Plan Strategy.	As per the refusal reasons, it has not been demonstrated that the proposed development would not be contrary to Policy NH2 and Policy NH5 of the Lisburn and Castlereagh City Council Plan Strategy.
Concerns that field to the rear of the application site will be developed in the future.	Each Planning application is assessed on its own merits. This application does not relate to the field to the rear of the application site and therefore no comment can be made in relation to it.
Did not receive Neighbour Notification.	Notice of, and publication of the application were carried out as per Article 8 of the Planning (General Development Procedure) Order (Northern Ireland) 2015 (GDPO). No. 220 Hillhall Road is a new dwelling and therefore it did not appear on the Council's internal system. The number of the dwelling was not exhibited externally at the property at the time of site inspection. However, given that the occupier has submitted an objection it is clear that they are aware of the application and therefore have not been prejudiced.

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

Week Ending 15th August 2025

Impact on view.	Impact on view is not a material Planning consideration of determining weight in the assessment of Planning applications.
No substantial or continuously built-up frontage.	As per refusal reason 2, it is considered that there is no existing substantial and continuously built-up frontage as defined by policy present on the ground.

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

Week Ending 15th August 2025

Item Number 3			
Application Reference	LA05/2024/0554/F	Date Valid	25.07.2024
Description of Proposal	Change of use from former school to hairdressing and beauty salon	Location	The Old School, 44 Church Road, Moneyreagh, Newtownards
Group Recommendation	Approval	Case Officer	Cara Breen
Reasons for Recommendation			
All relevant planning material considerations have been satisfied.			
Representations			
Objection Letters	Support Letters	Objection Petitions	Support Petitions
1	N/A	N/A	N/A
Consideration of Objections			
Issue	Consideration of Issue		
Concern regarding proximity of car parking.	It is acknowledged that currently the application site is predominantly hard standing and used for the purposes of car parking. There is a large mature hedgerow between the eastern (rear) boundary of the application site and the residential properties to the rear. Parking will also be available to the front of the building. Taking this into account, there are no concerns with regard to the potential impact on the proximity of car parking. LCCC Environmental Health were consulted as part of the processing of the application, and they subsequently responded with no concerns.		

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

Week Ending 15th August 2025

Item Number 4			
Application Reference	LA05/2024/0160/F	Date Valid	01.03.2024
Description of Proposal	Erection of a dwelling between 15 and 19 Ferndene Road. Landscape improvements to the areas of open space previously approved by permission LA05/2022/0164/F to the west of 19-27 Ferndene Road (odd no's) and to the south of 19-33 Ferndene Gardens (odd no's). Retention of extensions to the private gardens of 19, 21, 23, 25 and 27 Ferndene Road and proposed further extension to the garden of 19 Ferndene Road. Reorientation of substation previously approved by permission LA05/2022/0164/F on land to the south of 29 Ferndene Gardens.	Location	Between 15 and 19 Ferndene Road and 35 and 37 Ferndene Gardens, to the rear (west) of 19-27 Ferndene Road (odd no's) and to the south of 19-33 Ferndene Gardens (odd no's), Dundonald
Group Recommendation	Refusal	Case Officer	Catherine Gray
Reasons for Recommendation			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposal is contrary to Policy HOU3 Site Context and Characteristics of New Residential Development of the Lisburn and Castlereagh City Council Plan Strategy in that it would, if permitted, not create a quality and sustainable residential environment which respects the existing site context and characteristics. The proposal is contrary to criteria i) of Policy HOU4 Design in New Residential Development of the Lisburn and Castlereagh City Council Plan Strategy in that the design and layout of the proposal would create conflict with adjacent land uses, having an unacceptable adverse effect on existing properties in terms of overlooking. 			

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

Week Ending 15th August 2025

- The proposal is contrary to Policy OS1 Protection of Open Space of the Lisburn and Castlereagh City Council Plan Strategy, in that it would result in the loss of open space within the development; it has not been demonstrated that redevelopment will bring substantial community benefits that would decisively outweigh the loss of open space; and it has not been demonstrated that the loss of open space will have no significant detrimental impact on amenity, character or biodiversity of an area of open space of 2 hectares or less, where alternative provision is made by the developer and is as accessible to current users and equivalent in terms of size, usefulness, attractiveness, safety and quality.
- The proposal is contrary to criteria b) of Policy HOU8 Protecting Local Character, Environment Quality and Residential Amenity in Established Residential Areas of the Lisburn and Castlereagh City Council Plan Strategy, in that the pattern of development is not in keeping with the local character, environmental quality and existing residential amenity of the established residential area.

Representations

Objection Letters	Support Letters	Objection Petitions	Support Petitions
8	N/A	N/A	N/A

Consideration of Objections

Issue	Consideration of Issue
Overlooking and privacy.	<p>The view is expressed that the proposal would cause overlooking and loss of privacy. Concern is raised that the addition of this three-storey house so close to existing bungalows will remove any element of privacy that the homeowners currently have.</p> <p>The proposed dwelling has been designed to try to minimise overlooking and impact on neighbours' privacy however some windows to the side elevation facing no. 15 Ferndene Road present concerns with overlooking and impact on neighbours' privacy. Two of the windows serve a habitable room, the kitchen and would cause overlooking into the neighbour's private amenity. The proposal is considered to be contrary to criteria i) of Policy HOU4 in that the design and layout of the proposal would create conflict with adjacent land uses, having an unacceptable adverse effect on existing properties in terms of overlooking.</p>
Light.	<p>Concern is expressed that the proposal would cause loss of sunlight and reduction of light for neighbouring houses. With the view expressed that all other houses in this development have been set at a distance and this addition of a three-storey house beside bungalows will overpower them in terms of height thus blocking light.</p> <p>The positioning and height of the dwelling in relation to the closest neighbouring dwelling would cause a small amount of loss of sunlight however this is not considered to be detrimental to any neighbours' amenity in this urban context. It is considered that the proposal would not cause any unacceptable loss of light to neighbouring properties.</p>

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

Week Ending 15th August 2025

<p>Open Space.</p>	<p>Concern is raised that the proposed dwelling is on space that was to be retained as open space. Paragraph 45 in the original report for the wider site application LA05/2018/0042/F is quoted as giving considerable weight to this area remaining as open space. Also, the question is asked, is there not a need for a development to create shared, green space? The view is expressed that the proposed plot was designated as an open area in the original plans and concerns is raised that the remaining two open area on the site are clearly areas that the developer could not possibly develop as they are very steep, basically useless and dangerous for children to plan on or for anyone to use un any way for recreation. And that indeed the only open space that could have been used as a green amenity is not the subject of this planning application. The question is asked where children can safely play other than on the road, a road which has sharp and hidden bends and is rarely on the level. The view is expressed that they need this current open space as somewhere to play safely and away from traffic. And that there must be a duty of care requirement for a developer, that clearly is encouraging young families to an area to allocate suitable space for play and not as they read in the application submitted by the developer as an area of potentially anti-social behaviour. The proposed site was originally designated as open space – a vital green amenity within what is already a densely built hilltop development. The remaining undeveloped areas on the site are steep, hazardous, and unsuitable for recreational use. Open space must be usable, not steep, in accessible, or leftover land. The application seeks to eliminate the only level, usable area where children play safely, away from traffic and its removal would deprive families of the only meaningful communal outdoor space. The view is also expressed that PPS 7 and Creating Places recommends that developers are expected to provide adequate and meaningful open space as integral part of residential layouts with a minimum of 10% open space should be allocated to amenity space in new residential developments.</p> <p>The proposal would result in the loss of open space within the development. The applicant proposes to off sett the loss of open space where the new dwelling is proposed by offering an amended open space offering further along in the site however this reduces the existing private amenity space for one dwelling that had already been agreed and also reduces the amount of what is considered to be usable open space. The overall provision is still 10% of the overall development however the existing approved open space is considered to be a vital part of the already approved development. It acts as a transitional parcel of land between the existing and new development off Ferndene Road and also provides a pedestrian link between the new development and existing housing at Ferndene Gardens.</p> <p>The proposal is considered to be contrary to Policy OS1 in that it would result in the loss of open space within the development; it has not been demonstrated that redevelopment will bring substantial community benefits that would decisively outweigh the loss of open space; and it has not been demonstrated that the loss of open space will have no</p>
--------------------	---

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

Week Ending 15th August 2025

	significant detrimental impact on amenity, character or biodiversity of an area of open space of 2 hectares or less, where alternative provision is made by the developer and is as accessible to current users and equivalent in terms of size, usefulness, attractiveness, safety and quality.
Planned development.	The view is expressed that the fact that the development company numbered the first house of the development, 19, leaving the gap for house 17 for this new proposed build highlights the fact that the developer never intended to honour the original planning application, with this addition always being planned. And asks why is there a planning process? The view is expressed that this application was always going to be made. And that the developer shows contempt for both the planning process and the humble rate payers. Concern is raised about the developer's genuine commitment to creating a cohesive and inclusive neighbourhood. The actions of the developer outside the planning process are not material considerations that are given determining weight. Each application is considered on its own merits.
Neighbour notification.	<p>The view is expressed that this planning application has not been communicated to any of the directly adjacent homes.</p> <p>The Council has fulfilled its statutory obligations with regards to neighbour notification.</p>
Character of the area.	<p>The view is expressed that building yet another 3-storey dwelling in close proximity to existing single storey bungalows is definitely not in keeping with the homes in the greater Ferndene area. And that a 3-storey modern town house juxtaposed with 1970s bungalows is simply absurd and mocks any claimed semblance of a sympathetically planned development. Another expressed the view that the proposed building is positioned at the extreme edge of the plot, beside no. 15 a 1970s bungalow, looking out of place with the rest of the development and is no way in keeping with the existing properties. Its size and scale is wholly out of character creating a dominant and intrusive presence.</p> <p>The proposal is considered to be contrary to Policy HOU3 in that it would, if permitted, not create a quality and sustainable residential environment which respects the existing site context and characteristics. And the proposal is considered to be contrary to criteria b) of Policy HOU8 in that the pattern of development is not in keeping with the local character, environmental quality and existing residential amenity of the established residential area.</p>
Value of property.	<p>The objector expressed concerns about the proposal affecting the value of their property.</p> <p>The value of property is not a material consideration that is given determining weight.</p>

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

Week Ending 15th August 2025

Item Number 5			
Application Reference	LA05/2024/0851/RM	Date Valid	21.11.2024
Description of Proposal	Residential development comprising 3No detached dwellings, access and associated site works	Location	Lands approximately 10m Northwest of 188 Belsize Road, Lisburn
Group Recommendation	Approval	Case Officer	Sinead McCloskey
Reasons for Recommendation			
All relevant planning material considerations have been satisfied.			
Representations			
Objection Letters	Support Letters	Objection Petitions	Support Petitions
1	N/A	N/A	N/A
Consideration of Objections			
Issue	Consideration of Issue		
Impact on right of way	The P1 Form has indicated that there is no right of way within or adjoining the site. It can be seen that the site is removed from the four dwellings at Nos. 182 – 188 Belsize Road and that the proposed dwellings are utilizing a new access onto the Belsize Road from the site, located to the north of No. 184. As such, the access arrangements to the existing dwellings are not required to facilitate the proposed development. This is confirmed on the P1 Form which states that the proposal requires the construction of a new access to a public road and will not use an existing unaltered access to a public road. There are no changes proposed to the existing access layout, impeding any access to the respective properties.		
Traffic, Parking and Access.	It is not clear which area this specifically relates to, however it can be seen that the area of hardstanding for the parking of vehicles between the dwellings at Nos. 182 and 184 is outside of the red line of this application and as such is not affected by this application. Also, the stoned hardcore area to the front of the buildings to the northeast of the site and to the rear of these properties, which is presumed was the parking area for the entire garden centre, is also outside of the red line area and is seen to be largely retained, save that area where the new access is proposed. There are no other changes proposed to the areas immediately surrounding the dwellings at Nos. 182 and 184.		

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

Week Ending 15th August 2025

Item Number 6			
Application Reference	LA05/2024/0742/RM	Date Valid	16.10.2024
Description of Proposal	Erection of 2no. detached infill dwellings with linked detached garages, PV panels, septic tanks, driveway access and associated site works, including agricultural field access	Location	Lands between 99 and 103 Fort Road, Belfast
Group Recommendation	Approval	Case Officer	Kevin Maguire
Reasons for Recommendation			
All relevant planning material considerations have been satisfied.			
Representations			
Objection Letters	Support Letters	Objection Petitions	Support Petitions
2	N/A	N/A	N/A
Consideration of Objections			
Issue	Consideration of Issue		
Build-up of development in the area.	This is a reserved matters submission which gained outline planning permission under LA05/2022/1052/O, therefore the principle for two infill dwellings has already been established at this site.		
Increase in traffic volumes.	This submission relates to a reserved matters application where the principle for two dwellings has already been established. DfI Roads have raised no objections to the proposal in relation to adverse impacts on congestion.		
Impact on nearby local residents/animals	Any temporary noise may be generated during the construction phase of development would be controlled under separate legislation. Once built it is not considered that the proposal when occupied would result in excessive noise which would cause adverse impacts.		
No street lighting.	The development proposes no street lighting however there is no existing street lighting along this road which is in a rural location. DfI Roads have not requested lighting under this application and the scale of this development would be unlikely to necessitate such infrastructure.		
Impact on biodiversity/ecology.	There are no substantial areas of habitat located within or adjacent to the site. The front hedgerow, which is the most substantial area of		

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

Week Ending 15th August 2025

	existing planting within the site, is to be mainly retained as shown on the landscape proposals with the exception of the access point measuring approximately 10 metres wide. The Biodiversity Checklist has noted that the hedgerow is well maintained, and such activity may further reduce likelihood of significant biodiversity within this habitat.
Flooding on Fort Road.	DfI Rivers have confirmed that the site is not within an area of predicted pluvial flooding and not of a scale to require a Drainage Assessment. In relation to potential flooding on the public road, DfI Roads have noted that it is the responsibility of the developer to ensure that water does not flow from the site onto the public road (including verge or footway) and that existing roadside drainage is preserved and does not allow water from the road to enter the site.
Inconsistency of planning decisions in area.	Previous decisions were cited however from the information provided it is not clear where these relate to. There was an application submitted under LA05/2022/0079/F to the southeast however it was for a single dwelling and would not be comparable to the current proposal. Each application is determined on its own merit and in this case an outline application has already been approved which was determined would adhere to local planning policy.

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

Week Ending 15th August 2025

Item Number 7			
Application Reference	LA05/2024/0927/F	Date Valid	20.12.2024
Description of Proposal	Proposed dwelling to replace existing disused shop	Location	63a Gregg Street, Lisburn
Group Recommendation	Approval	Case Officer	Callum Henderson
Reasons for Recommendation			
All relevant planning material considerations have been satisfied.			
Representations			
Objection Letters	Support Letters	Objection Petitions	Support Petitions
1	N/A	N/A	N/A
Consideration of Objections			
Issue	Consideration of Issue		
Right of way.	Right of way is to be retained and sits outside of the redline boundary.		
Overpopulation.	Overpopulation is not a material consideration. The proposal is for a single dwelling in the settlement of Lisburn. The 2-bedroom dwelling is not considered to materially alter the volume of movements along Gregg Street, with 2 parking spaces provided in curtilage. DfI Roads were consulted and offered no objection. Regarding the design, the single dwelling would bookend an established terrace and would mimic its form, scale and materials of the existing terrace row, the design is considered appropriate.		