

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

**Week Ending 20th March 2026**

Item Number 1			
<b>Application Reference</b>	LA05/2024/0693/F	<b>Date Valid</b>	26.09.2024
<b>Description of Proposal</b>	The erection of a cafe external electric awning	<b>Location</b>	Bob & Berts, 29-33 Bow Street, Lisburn
<b>Group Recommendation</b>	Refusal	<b>Case Officer</b>	Jade Gillespie
Reasons for Recommendation			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proposal is contrary to criteria a) of Policy HE10 of the Lisburn and Castlereagh City Council Plan Strategy in that the proposal is not in sympathy with the characteristic built form of Lisburn Conservation Area.</li> <li>The proposal is contrary to criteria b) of Policy HE10 of the Lisburn and Castlereagh City Council Plan Strategy in that the scale, form, materials and detailing of the development do not respect the characteristics of adjoining buildings in the Lisburn Conservation Area.</li> <li>The proposal is contrary to criteria d) of Policy HE10 of the Lisburn and Castlereagh City Council Plan Strategy in that the important views within, into and out of the Lisburn Conservation Area will not be protected.</li> <li>The proposal is contrary to criteria f) of Policy HE10 of the Lisburn and Castlereagh City Council Plan Strategy in that the development does not conform with guidance set out in Supplementary Planning Guidance, Part E.</li> </ul>			
Representations			
<b>Objection Letters</b>	<b>Support Letters</b>	<b>Objection Petitions</b>	<b>Support Petitions</b>
0	N/A	N/A	N/A
Consideration of Objections			
<b>Issue</b>	<b>Consideration of Issue</b>		

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

**Week Ending 20th March 2026**

Item Number 2			
<b>Application Reference</b>	LA05/2026/0044/F	<b>Date Valid</b>	14.01.2026
<b>Description of Proposal</b>	Single storey extension to the rear of the existing dwelling	<b>Location</b>	172 Moira Road, Lisburn
<b>Group Recommendation</b>	Approval	<b>Case Officer</b>	Jade Gillespie
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			
Issue	Consideration of Issue		
The plans fail to detail the height of the proposed extension.	It is not a statutory requirement to detail the measurements of a proposal on the plans. The proposed extension will have an eaves height of approximately 3.27 metres to the flat roof and a maximum height of approximately 4.02 metres to the top of the raised rooflight.		
The proposed extension will cause significant overshadowing and material loss of sunlight to the garden of No.18 Laganville Park.	<p>The proposed extension will reside approximately 5.30 metres from the boundary shared with No.18 Laganville Park and approximately 13.00 metres from this neighbour's rear elevation. There is a high timber fence along the shared boundary. In addition to this, No.18 also resides on a slightly higher ground level than the application site and is orientated within its plot so that the rear elevation does not face directly onto the host property.</p> <p>The proposed extension is not considered to reside in a location that would result in overshadowing or loss of light to the occupiers of No.18. It is noted here that the host property is two storey and is south facing. As the proposed extension is single storey in scale, it is not considered to enhance any existing degree of overshadowing already caused by the main dwellinghouse. Given the set off of the extension from the shared boundary, any overshadowing caused by the extension is not considered to reach to the curtilage of No.18.</p>		
The proposed extension will appear overbearing.	Due to the separation distance between the proposed extension and No.18, the existing boundary treatment and ground level difference, the proposed extension is not considered to reside in a location that would allow it to appear overbearing to the occupiers of No.18.		

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

**Week Ending 20th March 2026**

<p>The proposal will create a sense of enclosure to the garden of No.18 Laganville Park.</p>	<p>The proposed extension, with a set off of approximately 5.30 metres is not considered to reside in close enough proximity to the boundary shared with No.18 to result in a sense of enclosure to this neighbour. The high timber fence along the shared boundary and No.18's higher ground level will also prevent any sense of enclosure.</p>
<p>The proposed extension includes a raised skylight and therefore the roof of the extension is not flat as previously stated. Concern is raised regarding the accuracy of the plans.</p>	<p>The plans indicate that the roof of the extension is flat with a raised roof light. The roof form of the extension is not misleading. This is clearly evident on the plans. Furthermore, the plans submitted have been scaled to accurately reflect the proposal.</p>
<p>Concerns regarding the amount of light that will be omitted from the raised skylight.</p>	<p>The proposed extension is to a residential property. It is not considered that the light that would omit from the raised rooflight would exceed the normal domestic standard and result in a detrimental degree of light pollution.</p>
<p>The extension will be viewable to the occupiers of No.18 Laganville Park and concern is raised regarding privacy.</p>	<p>The proposed extension is not considered to result in any loss of privacy to the occupiers of No.18. At present, from the rear garden of the host property, the ground floor windows on the rear elevation of No.18 are not viewable due to the existing high timber fencing along the shared boundary. The proposed extension is single storey. No new view of No.18 is considered to be obtained as a result of this extension being erected.</p>
<p>Concern is raised in relation to how the impact of the proposed works will be minimised in terms of noise, dust and general disturbance.</p>	<p>It is not uncommon for a development site to generate noise, dust and general disturbance until the development is completed. These are considered to be normal impacts in relation to the development of land the issue raised is given little weight in the assessment of this application. That said it does not remove the obligation of the developers and their contractors to be considerate neighbours and to not cause nuisance for the duration of the works.</p>
<p>The proposed extension would constitute overdevelopment of the existing plot and interfere with the current</p>	<p>The proposed extension will reside to the rear of the dwelling and will not be viewable from the street scene. In this respect, the extension is not found to directly impact the character of the surrounding area. In addition to this, the proposed extension is found to sit comfortably within its plot and has been designed and scaled to be in keeping with the character of the main dwellinghouse.</p>

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

**Week Ending 20th March 2026**

<p>aesthetic of the area.</p>	
<p>Concern that the proposed extension would result in issues for the occupiers of No.18 Laganville Park in the maintenance of their fence and hedges given that the proposal projects towards their boundary.</p>	<p>Boundary maintenance is a civil matter. The proposed extension is set off the boundary shared with No.18 by approximately 5.30 metres. It is not obvious how the proposed extension would cause boundary maintenance issues for the occupiers of No.18.</p>
<p>The proposed plans make no mention of proposed timescale for the works.</p>	<p>In the event of an approval, this application will be conditioned with a time limit to commence development within five years from the date of approval. The applicant will therefore have five years to implement to development.</p>

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

**Week Ending 20th March 2026**

<b>Item Number 3</b>			
<b>Application Reference</b>	LA05/2025/0152/F	<b>Date Valid</b>	27.02.2025
<b>Description of Proposal</b>	Demolition of existing structures on site and proposed redevelopment of 24hr unmanned Petrol Filling Station (8no. pump) with associated canopy; 1no. control room/store; services bay (air/water/vac); tanker stand; drive thru car wash (2 bays); lance washes including canopy (4 bays); valet bays; access works; and all other associated site and access works.	<b>Location</b>	1087 Upper Newtownards Road, Dundonald
<b>Group Recommendation</b>	Approval	<b>Case Officer</b>	Jordan Campbell
<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>
5	1	N/A	N/A
<b>Consideration of Objections</b>			
<b>Issue</b>	<b>Consideration of Issue</b>		
Adverse light and noise.	Consultation was undertaken with Environmental Health in relation to potential light and noise impacts. Environmental Health reviewed all submitted supporting information and raised no objections to the proposal, subject to the imposition of appropriate conditions. It is therefore considered that the proposed development would not result in any harmful levels of light or noise and is therefore deemed acceptable.		
Adverse to road safety and convenience.	DFI Roads reviewed the development proposal and offered no objections. Therefore it is considered that the proposed development would not prejudice road safety or significantly inconvenience the flow of vehicles.		

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

**Week Ending 20th March 2026**

<p>Adverse to surrounding neighbouring properties.</p>	<p>From a visual amenity perspective, the proposed development is expected to deliver a substantial improvement to the appearance of the site and its wider setting. The introduction of a modern, well-designed filling station, supported by a comprehensive landscaping scheme, would transform the currently derelict land into an attractive and positive feature within the locality. Accordingly, the proposal is not considered to result in any harmful impact on the visual amenity of neighbouring properties.</p> <p>Regarding impact on residential amenity, and specifically in relation to privacy, it is considered that the proposal would not result in any adverse impact on the level of privacy currently enjoyed by neighbouring residential occupants. All potential views would be fully obscured by the proposed boundary treatments and landscaping, ensuring that no overlooking or loss of privacy would arise.</p>
--	---

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

**Week Ending 20th March 2026**

Item Number 4			
<b>Application Reference</b>	LA05/2025/0924/F	<b>Date Valid</b>	19.12.2025
<b>Description of Proposal</b>	Ground Floor Bedroom & Lobby Rear Extension	<b>Location</b>	6 Windermere Avenue, Lisburn,
<b>Group Recommendation</b>	Approval	<b>Case Officer</b>	Barbara Hanna
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>
2	N/A	N/A	N/A
Consideration of Objections			
Issue	Consideration of Issue		
Overshadowing and loss of light to kitchen/dining room.	A light test has been submitted by the agent. The kitchen/dining room at No.8 Windermere Avenue is served by a second window which is not adversely affected, as such there is no unacceptable overshadowing/loss of light.		
Noise disturbance during construction works will exacerbate health issues.	It is not uncommon for a development site to generate noise until the development is completed. These are considered to be normal impacts in relation to the development of land. The issue raised is given little weight in the assessment of this application. That said it does not remove the obligation of the developers and their contractors to be considerate neighbours and to not cause nuisance for the duration of the works.  Any noise considered excessive should be reported to LCCC Environmental Health for further investigation.		
Spatial relationship with existing dwellings is harmful to amenity.	The PAC decision referenced (2018/A0045) relates to an application for the erection of 4 dwellings and is not considered comparable. The proposed extension is single storey and subordinate in scale and form to the existing two-story dwelling. A light test has been submitted by the agent, and it is evident that the second window serving the open plan kitchen/dining area is not adversely affected by the proposal. There are no additional windows along the side elevation facing No.8 Windermere Avenue. As such the proposal will not unduly impact on the privacy and amenity of No.8 Windermere.		

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

**Week Ending 20th March 2026**

Item Number 5			
<b>Application Reference</b>	LA05/2024/0524/F	<b>Date Valid</b>	05.07.2024
<b>Description of Proposal</b>	Proposed extension to existing public bar/restaurant providing both indoor and outdoor seating for patrons and ancillary works to access.	<b>Location</b>	149 Ballyskeagh Road, Drumbeg, Belfast
<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>
22	108	N/A	N/A
Consideration of Objections			
Issue	Consideration of Issue		
Impact on the listed building.	Historic Buildings Unit have been consulted and have raised no issues with the proposal in relation to impact upon the listed building.		
Adverse amenity impacts including noise and odour.	A noise impact assessment and odour report was submitted in support of the application. Further information was requested during the processing of the application which Environmental Health have reviewed and are content with the proposal subject to conditions.		
Anti-social behaviour.	Any anti-social behaviour which results from the development is not a planning matter rather a matter for the PSNI		
Doubling the size of the premises despite lack of parking.	The applicant has advised that the extension would result in 12 number parking spaces being lost, with 44 spaces remaining available, however this is comparable to a similar extension under LA05/2021/1323/F which was proposed but subsequently withdrawn which DfI Roads were content with. Based on the most recent DfI Roads consultation in relation to parking there would be no basis to refuse this proposal.		
Overdominance of extension to existing premises.	The proposed extension to the existing building is sited to the rear with little visibility from Ballyskeagh Road. The building would only be apparent to rear within the car park area. While it does propose a sizeable extension its single storey form and use of more modern		

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

**Week Ending 20th March 2026**

	materials to differentiate from the existing building would help to reduce the overdominance and apparent scale of the proposal.
Unsafe access through increased usage of site.	The applicant provided amended plans showing a small portion of the external wall to the front of the existing public house to be altered. DfI Roads have reviewed this and have indicated no objections to these latest access proposals.
Would increase traffic along Ballyskeagh Road.	A Transport Assessment Form and Parking Statement was submitted with the application however as the proposal is below the 500 sqm threshold where the full Transport Assessment is required. While in their responses DfI Roads have indicated there is intensification due to the additional seating areas, no concerns are raised in relation to an increase in traffic along Ballyskeagh Road which would prejudice road safety or significantly inconvenience the flow of vehicles.
Footpath along main road is not consistent adjoining the site.	There are existing footpaths at either side of Ballyskeagh Road in front of the existing restaurant. There are no defined footpaths along the access laneway into the car park at the rear however it is envisaged this access will primarily be used by vehicles, with pedestrian access taken through the existing front entrance.
Previous events have caused parking along the public road which have blocked private accesses.	The decision to hold events at the site falls outside the remit of this planning application.
Impact of proposal in cumulative terms when considering 'Hatch Service'.	This appears to relate to the existing listed building at No 145/147 Ballyskeagh Road and is separate from this proposal. The applicant has advised that this is no longer operational.
The "take away" food component of the plan potentially will increase litter and food waste leading to increased vermin activity.	This application does not propose a 'takeaway' element either in the description or on the plans submitted. In the event that some food is taken off the premises, littering from this would be covered by legislation. No concerns in relation to pests/vermin have been raised within the comments provided by Environmental Health.
Proposal to be serviced by Drumbeg WWTW which is already deemed to be at capacity (on the basis of 8 fewer	NI Water have advised that the applicant has submitted a Wastewater Impact Assessment and a WWIA is not deemed complete until a solution at Stage 2 has been agreed upon and deemed deliverable by both NIW and the developer. The latest correspondence from NIW it is noted that Stage 2 has been signed off, a solution has been agreed, and works are currently ongoing to deliver it however these works must be fully completed. It has been advised that the condition recommended in their

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

**Week Ending 20th March 2026**

<p>residents between the censuses of 2011 and 2021 and 17 more dwellings has calculated an additional 226 PEs at the Drumbeg WwTw). Absence of comprehensive review by LCCC.</p>	<p>latest consultation response would remain applicable to any planning approval.</p>
<p>Information provided on storm water drainage.</p>	<p>The application form has stated that surface water will be directed towards the main sewer, and the submission has been supported by a storm separation drawing which has been shared with consultees. NI Water has been consulted on this application and has raised no issues in relation to discharge of surface water to public sewer however has noted that applicant will be required to obtain approval to connect.</p>
<p>Potential increase for vermin due to outdoor dining and location of bins adjacent to residential property.</p>	<p>Bins were previously stored in 'keg yard' adjacent to the boundary with No 59 Ballyskeagh Road as shown on existing site plan drawing. This location has been amended under the proposed plans to be located further back into the site adjacent to the boundary with No 59. It is not considered that this relocation will cause any additional adverse impact on neighbouring properties.</p>
<p>Biodiversity impacts through noise, light and human activity and adequacy of assessment received.</p>	<p>The site already contains a restaurant/public house as well as associated parking area and associated lights, therefore human activity has already been established on the site. The proposed extension is to the rear of the existing building and would appear to result in minimal changes to the structure of the existing building. A Biodiversity Checklist and Bat Activity Survey undertaken by qualified ecologist has been submitted which has concluded that there was no evidence of roosting bats within the buildings on site and the proposal is highly unlikely to disturb or destroy bat roosts. The Biodiversity Checklist with extended ecological statement did not identify any other species or habitat that would be affected by the proposal.</p>
<p>Light pollution.</p>	<p>The application involves an extension to the rear of the existing bar/restaurant however this is all contained within the existing developed area and car park already in situ. This car park already contains existing lamp posts and low-level lamps, and the proposed development does not propose any additional external lighting.</p>
<p>Encourage enforcement of sustainable, green, and environmentally</p>	<p>While the proposed extension will continue to generate car trips as is currently the case with the existing building, the proposed modern building envelope and solar panels will assist in promoting environmental building practices.</p>

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

**Week Ending 20th March 2026**

positive building practices for this development.	
There was a delay in receiving neighbour notification.	This issue is outside the control of the Council however additional time has been allowed for the submission of third-party representations.
Potential cumulative development with other proposals in the area (e.g. boutique hotel) and absence of a comprehensive, strategic review by LCCC.	It is not considered that an extension to an existing public house/restaurant would lead to unacceptable cumulative impact. The objection refers to the proposed boutique hotel under LA05/2022/0946/O however to date no decision has been made on this and it would not be reasonable to hold this application in abeyance until a decision on that application has been made. There are no other proposals ongoing or approved which are of a scale in the immediate area which would require to be considered in a comprehensive strategic review.
There is no demand for scale of extension and would encourage increased car dependence.	This relates to the extension of an existing bar and restaurant and is not a new development. While it is likely that this will encourage additional trips to the site the appropriate infrastructure including the existing car parking facilities has been deemed to be of sufficient scale to deal with the level of car usage. DfI Roads have been fully consulted on the proposals and have raised no issues in relation to likely traffic generation.
Impact of proposal, both individually and cumulatively, on the character of the area.	The proposal relates to the extension of an existing bar/restaurant business and is sited entirely within the grounds of the current facility. While the extension does involve a significant extension, its position to the rear of the existing will result in minimal views from both Ballyskeagh Road and views from the riverside path further to the northwest. In addition to the limited views of the proposal from public vantage points, it is considered that the ridge height, design and materials used would not be inappropriate and would not adversely impact the character of the area.
Given the number of letters of support it is requested that a wider public consultation of the proposal is undertaken.	While this option was available to the applicant prior to the submission of the application the application is not categorised as a major development and there is no legislative requirement for a wider public consultation to be undertaken.

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

**Week Ending 20th March 2026**

<p>Breach of LCCC's settlement policy if approved.</p>	<p>The proposed extension is located within the defined settlement development limit for Drumbeg within both the Lisburn Area Plan and draft Belfast Metropolitan Area Plan however a portion of the rear car park is outside of this defined limit. In this case this car park is not being altered/extended under this application and itself has been subject to a number of certificates of lawfulness including LA05/2017/1028/LDE and LA05/2019/0879/LDE which have been deemed lawful.</p>
<p>One of the plans show 'Ballynaskeagh Road' instead of 'Ballyskeagh Road'.</p>	<p>This minor typo has been included on the site plan however this point has no impact on the rest of the drawing or the understanding of it in the mind of the reader. This has not been carried into the description of the application on the form submitted, on the planning register or either the neighbour notification letters or public advertisement, and therefore this would cause no prejudice to people wishing to comment on the proposal.</p>
<p>Site is located within Lagan Valley Regional Park, and this should be awarded significant weight.</p>	<p>It is acknowledged that the development is located within the LVRP however this does not preclude development being approved provided that it meets the relevant planning policy tests. It is not considered that the proposal would be contrary to the aims of the Lagan Valley Regional Park Plan. While it is noted that the Lagan Valley Regional Park Office has objected to the proposal it is contended that the application would meet the relevant planning policy.</p>
<p>Letters of support have used standardised letter format, and some have been submitted by people not living in the area.</p>	<p>There is nothing to preclude people from outside of the immediate area of the site submitting letters of representation, either support or objection, on the application. All of these letters are assessed objectively and afforded weight based on their content and relevance to planning policy.</p>

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

**Week Ending 20th March 2026**

Item Number 6			
<b>Application Reference</b>	LA05/2023/0418/F	<b>Date Valid</b>	18.05.2023
<b>Description of Proposal</b>	Farm diversification to provide for 4 no proposed glamping pods, 2 sauna barrels and associated site works	<b>Location</b>	Lands approx. 110m Southwest of 41 Lakeland Road, Hillsborough and immediately North of 43/45 Lakeland Road, Hillsborough
<b>Group Recommendation</b>	Refusal	<b>Case Officer</b>	Kevin Maguire
Reasons for Recommendation			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proposal is contrary to Policy COU1 of the Lisburn and Castlereagh City Council's 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 TOU3 of the Lisburn and Castlereagh City Council's Plan Strategy, in that the proposal is does not meet the criteria for the 'expansion of an existing tourist accommodation' in that criteria (a) the new buildings would not be subsidiary to the existing buildings and would not integrate as part of the overall development.</li> <li>The proposal is contrary to Policy TOU3 of the Lisburn and Castlereagh City Council's Plan Strategy, in that the proposal is does not meet the criteria for the 'expansion of an existing tourist accommodation' in that criteria (b) the new building would not respect the scale, design and materials of the original building.</li> <li>The proposal is contrary to criteria (a) of Policy TOU4 of the Lisburn and Castlereagh City Council's Plan Strategy, in that the development is not located within the grounds of an existing or approved tourist accommodation or holiday park.</li> <li>The proposal is contrary to criteria (b) of Policy TOU4 of the Lisburn and Castlereagh City Council's Plan Strategy, in that the development would not consist of a cluster of 3 or more new units which are close to an existing or approved tourism amenity that is/will be a significant visitor attraction in its own right.</li> <li>The proposal is contrary to criteria (a) of Policy COU11 of the Lisburn and Castlereagh City Council Plan Strategy, in that it has not been demonstrated that the farm business is currently active and established (for a minimum of 6 years) and the development would not satisfactorily integrate with an existing group of buildings.</li> <li>The proposal is contrary to criteria (b) of Policy COU15 of the Lisburn and Castlereagh City Council Plan Strategy, in that the development is not sited to cluster with an established group of buildings.</li> </ul>			

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

**Week Ending 20th March 2026**

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proposal is contrary to criteria (b) of Policy COU16 of the Lisburn and Castlereagh City Council Plan Strategy, in that the development is not sited to cluster with an established group of buildings.</li> <li>The proposal is contrary to Policy RE2 of the Lisburn and Castlereagh City Council Plan Strategy and Paragraph 6.232 of the Strategic Planning Policy Statement, in that it has not been demonstrated that the proposed development has considered the appropriate use of micro-generation energy.</li> </ul>			
Representations			
Objection Letters	Support Letters	Objection Petitions	Support Petitions
10	N/A	N/A	N/A
Consideration of Objections			
Issue	Consideration of Issue		
Description on P1 form is incomplete.	It is considered that the current description on the application accurately identifies the proposed development.		
Drawings are inaccurate.	It is considered that the current drawings that have been submitted with the application would accurately reflect what has been included in the development description.		
Site address is not reflective of 50% of the proposed development.	The site address has been amended to better reflect the site location, which is divided into two separate locations, and this has been re-advertised and re-neighbour notified with neighbours/objectors.		
Inaccurate certificate.	The application was originally submitted with Certificate A completed. An amended application form completing Certificate C was subsequently submitted and further re-neighbour notified with no further issues raised. Any further disputes on land ownership would be a civil matter.		
EIA screening required.	This assessment has now been undertaken concluding that the development would not be EIA development and require the submission of an Environmental Statement.		
Traffic impacts on narrow road.	The proposal is relatively small scale and while there is likely to be some intensification of the existing access the additional traffic generated is likely to be low. DfI Roads have been consulted and following further details provided on the access no information on traffic impacts using Lakeland Road has been requested.		
Impacts on road surface.	Impacts on the road surface is outside of the remit of planning and is dealt with under separate roads legislation. Should the application be approved, DfI Roads have recommended an informative recommending precaution for the developer to take to prevent the deposit of mud and other debris during construction stage.		

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

**Week Ending 20th March 2026**

Impact on privacy for users of lake.	The distance between the lake and closest glamping pod is approximately 50 metres, with the rest of the site further away. Impacts on privacy in relation to use of a lake would not be a material planning consideration.
Impacts on wildlife.	The site is situated close to both Lough Aghery and Cluntagh Lough. The application was submitted with a Biodiversity Checklist and associated Ecological Statement completed by a qualified ecologist. It concluded that there will be no impact on protected or priority species or habitats. This was shared with NIEA NED who have reviewed and have raised no concerns with the proposal based on their own assessment.
Privacy impacts on nearby dwellings.	The two dwellings proposed in the eastern portion of the site would be approximately 80 to 90 metres from the dwellings at No 43 and 45 Lakeland Road. While the associated amenity areas will be closer, due to the separation distance, intervening vegetation and nature of the proposal, it is not considered that it would adversely impact on the privacy on nearby dwellings.
Noise impacts.	Environmental Health have been consulted and have raised no concerns in relation to noise. Due to the nature and scale of the proposal it is unlikely that the development would result in adverse noise impacts.
Should have received NN letter.	Section 41 of the 2011 Planning Act and Article 8(2) of the GDPO outlines the arrangements for neighbour notification and notes that notice must be sent to any identified occupier on neighbouring land. In this case it was considered that the neighbour was not considered to meet the definition neighbouring land, however following objection letters were sent to this address.
Applicants are not farmers	The applicant has submitted evidence to indicate that they are farmers, through the provision of a farm Business ID and associated farm map. This, however, does not mean that the development is acceptable in relation to Policy COU11 which relates to farm diversification proposals.
LA05/2016/0328/F for holiday accommodation had not been implemented.	From site visit it is clear that the development approved under LA05/2016/0328/F has been constructed; however, it has not been confirmed if this is yet operational. A Certificate of Lawfulness was submitted under LA05/2024/0454/CLEUD which has demonstrated that the development was commenced within the timescales required.
Loss of property value.	There is no evidence to quantify whether the approval of the proposal would lead to a loss in property value. This is not a material planning consideration.
Environmental impact of hot tubs.	The plans do not show the provision of hot tubs. Two sauna barrels have been proposed however both NIEA Water Management Unit and Natural Environment Division have been consulted and have raised no issues relating to these.
Applicant has no RoW over shared driveway.	The applicant has advised that the land does have access to the lane in question and has 3 gates to access both fields either side of the lane. Issues relating to land ownership or rights of way are a civil matter and would need to be addressed by the relevant parties.