

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

Week Ending 21st February 2025

Item Number 1			
Application Reference	LA05/2022/0140/F	Date Valid	03.02.2022
Description of Proposal	Retrospective application for retention of communications mast with Mast House offices and vehicular parking and fencing	Location	48 Tullyrusk Road Dundrod Crumlin
Group Recommendation	Refusal	Case Officer	Michael Vladeanu
Reasons for Recommendation			
<p>The proposal is contrary to Policy COU1 of the Lisburn & Castlereagh Plan Strategy in that the development is not an acceptable form of development in the countryside</p> <p>The proposal is contrary to criteria (a-f) of Policy COU15 of the Lisburn & Castlereagh Plan Strategy in that the development if approved would be a prominent feature in the landscape and has not been sited to cluster with an established group of buildings. The site lacks long established natural boundaries being unable to provide a suitable degree of enclosure for the development to integrate into the landscape. The development would rely primality on new landscape for integration and fails to relate to the landform and existing trees, slopes and other natural features which provide a backdrop. The design of the building is of an inappropriate design.</p> <p>The proposal is contrary to criteria (a), (b) and (e) of Policy COU16 of the Lisburn & Castlereagh Plan Strategy in that the development if permitted would be unduly prominent in the landscape. The development is not sited to cluster with an established group of buildings and would have an adverse impact on the rural character of the area.</p> <p>The proposal is contrary to criteria (n) of Policy ED9 of the Lisburn & Castlereagh Plan Strategy in that it has not been demonstrated that satisfactory measures are in place to assist with the developments integration within the countryside.</p> <p>The proposal is contrary to criteria (a), (b) and (c) of Policy TEL1 of the Lisburn & Castlereagh Plan Strategy in that there is insufficient information to demonstrate that the sharing of an existing mast or another structure has been investigated and is not feasible, nor that the provision of the development represents a better environmental solution than other options. In addition, it has not been demonstrated that there is a need for this particular development and how it fits into the operators or broadcaster's wider network.</p>			
Representations			
Objection Letters	Support Letters	Objection Petitions	Support Petitions
3	N/A	N/A	N/A

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

Week Ending 21st February 2025

Consideration of Objections	
Issue	Consideration of Issue
<p>Flooding of highway and neighbouring properties.</p>	<p>The objector is concerned that the raised land levels allow water to flow directly onto the highway and towards neighbouring properties, causing flooding and water to pool on the highway, causing adverse driving conditions especially when icy.</p> <p>Whilst the agent has not supplied any topological drawings, from reviewing google earth imagery dated 2011 it would appear that levels remain broadly similar between pre and post development.</p> <p>A drainage Assessment is not required as the proposal does not meet the thresholds set out under Policy FLD3, ultimately it is the developer's responsibility to assess the flood risk and drainage impact and to mitigate the risk to the development and any impacts beyond the site. DFI Rivers have been consulted on the application from a drainage and flood risk aspect and raise no objection.</p> <p>The proposal complies with policies FLD1, FLD2, FLD3, FLD4 and FLD5 of the Plan Strategy.</p>
<p>Dumping rubbish/fires.</p>	<p>The objector has reported excess rubbish, dumping and lighting of fires occurring on the site.</p> <p>During a site inspection it was observed that there was no excess rubbish, dumping or lighting of fires at this location.</p>
<p>Road safety.</p>	<p>The objector raises concern around increase in large vehicles visiting the site to and from the site.</p> <p>DFI Roads were consulted and have considered all accompanying detail with the application and objector comments and offer no objection to the proposal. Therefore, the proposal complies with Policy TRA2 of the Plan Strategy.</p>
<p>Character and appearance of the countryside.</p>	<p>Objectors have raised concerns over the surrounding fencing of the compound and their impact on the surrounding countryside.</p> <p>Material weight has been attached to this comment, and it is regarded that the visual impact design is inappropriate in this rural location.</p>
<p>Loss of privacy.</p>	<p>Objector raises concern over loss of privacy from workers working at a height on the communication mast and CCTV.</p> <p>During a site visit it was observed that there was CCTV cameras in operation however, the cameras face onto the parking/access to the site and are not placed directly facing the adjacent properties. In addition, the CCTV cameras are set back from the road and are positioned</p>

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

Week Ending 21st February 2025

	<p>approximately 45m from the neighbouring properties adjacent the site on the southern side of Tullyrusk Road.</p> <p>Regarding the potential for workers at height on the communications mast to overlook neighbouring properties, it is noted that maintenance activities will be infrequent and limited to short durations. The nature of such work means that workers will only be present on the mast sporadically for essential servicing and repairs, rather than on a continuous or regular basis. Given this, it is not anticipated that the presence of workers at height will result in a significant or sustained impact on privacy.</p>
<p>Planning history in the area.</p>	<p>The objector raises concern around previous refusals for residential properties in the countryside and immediate area.</p> <p>No material weight has been attached to this comment, each planning application is determined on its own merit.</p>

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

Week Ending 21st February 2025

Item Number 2			
Application Reference	LA05/2023/0638/F	Date Valid	03.08.2023
Description of Proposal	Alterations to existing dwelling to include extension to rear of dwelling to provide studio workspace, rooflights to rear slope, Solar panels to front roof slope, internal alterations to relocate bathroom, rear bedroom and alterations to relocate kitchen.	Location	15 Llewellyn Avenue, Lisburn
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		
Accuracy of Light Test/Potential Loss of Light.	In terms of potential overshadowing/loss of light, it is acknowledged that the submitted light tests are not entirely accurate, therefore the Council have assessed this, as per Figure 1 of the Supplementary Planning Guidance, Part A. The proposed extension does not satisfy the 60-degree light test, however as per the guidance, this it is not a rigid standard which must be met in every case. The Supplementary Planning Guidance advises that it is an assessment tool which will be engaged in conjunction with other relevant factors to gauge the acceptability of a proposal. The guidance offers other relevant factors which are to be taken into account. The proposed extension incorporates a significant degree of glazing allowing light to easily penetrate. Furthermore, the proposed extension would sit at a ground level circa 0.6 metres below the existing FFL of the host dwelling and neighbouring dwelling. At a height of approximately 3 metres, the proposed extension, which would be flat roofed, would not extend above the top of the existing neighbouring window to the rear elevation of No. 13 Llewellyn Avenue. The height of the extension drops to circa 2.7 metres for the last 0.8 metres and daylight to the rear		

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

Week Ending 21st February 2025

	<p>elevation of No. 13 Llewellyn Avenue is already curtailed by the existing situation on the ground within its own curtilage. It is recognized that the majority of terrace dwellings in the area have development up to the rear yard wall or beyond. Taking all of the above into account, it is contended that the proposal would not significantly exacerbate the existing situation on the ground in terms of loss of light to an unreasonable degree. With regards to No. 17 Llewellyn Avenue, it is noted that it has rear development which extends up to the rear yard wall. A shed is then in situ directly to the other side of the wall. There are no concerns with regards to overshadowing to an unreasonable degree. As per the proposed plans, there would be no overhanging into to any neighbouring property. Having considered all of the above, there are no unreasonable concerns in relation to any potential impact on residential amenity</p>
--	--