

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

Week Ending 22nd May 2026

Item Number 1			
Application Reference	LA05/2023/0751/F	Date Valid	20.09.2023
Description of Proposal	Restoration of a rural, 3-bedroom, vernacular farmhouse for self-catering tourist accommodation	Location	119A Comber Road, Royal Hillsborough
Group Recommendation	Refusal	Case Officer	Michael Vladeanu
Reasons for Recommendation			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal is contrary to Policy COU1 of the Lisburn & 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 criteria (e) of Policy HE13 of the Lisburn & Castlereagh Plan Strategy, in that it has not been demonstrated that the nature of the use as self-catering tourist accommodation is appropriate to its location. • The proposal is contrary to Policy TOU3 of the Lisburn & Castlereagh City Council Plan Strategy, in that the proposal is not located on the periphery of a settlement, it does not involve the replacement of an existing rural building, and it is not for the expansion of existing tourist accommodation. • The proposal is contrary to criteria (a) and (b) of Policy TOU4 of the Lisburn & Castlereagh City Council Plan Strategy, in that the development is not located within the grounds of an existing or approved tourist accommodation or holiday park, and does not provide a cluster of 3 or more new units at or close to an existing or approved tourism amenity that is/will be a significant visitor attraction in its own right. • The proposal is contrary to criteria (a) of Policy TOU7 of the Lisburn & Castlereagh City Council Plan Strategy, in that It has not been demonstrated that the proposal provides walking and cycling provision, adequate and convenient access to public transport or meets the needs of people whose mobility is restricted. • The proposal is contrary to criteria (i) of Policy COU16 of the Lisburn & Castlereagh City Council Plan Strategy, in that it has not been demonstrated that access to the public road cannot be achieved without prejudice to road safety or significantly inconvenience the flow of traffic. • The proposal is contrary to Policy TRA2 of the Lisburn & Castlereagh City Council Plan Strategy, in that it would, if permitted, prejudice the safety and convenience of road users since it proposes to intensify the use of an existing access at which visibility splays cannot be provided in accordance with the standards contained in the Department's Development Control Advice Note 15. 			

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

Week Ending 22nd May 2026

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposal is contrary to Policy TRA7 of the Lisburn & Castlereagh City Council Plan Strategy, in that it would, if permitted, prejudice the safety and convenience of road users since adequate provision cannot be made clear of the highway for the parking of vehicles which would be attracted to the site. 			
Representations			
Objection Letters	Support Letters	Objection Petitions	Support Petitions
4	18	N/A	N/A
Consideration of Objections			
Issue	Consideration of Issue		
Incorrect application form submitted.	Initially a householder application form was submitted with the application. However, following discussions with the applicant a full application form for permission to develop the land was requested and has been provided. The correct application form has been submitted with the application.		
The subject building is in breach of condition 2 imposed on S/2005/0224/F.	The subject building was required to be demolished under condition 2 of planning permission S/2005/0224/F. This condition required demolition of the original farmhouse, and all rubble and foundations removed prior to commencement of the replacement dwelling. This is a matter for planning enforcement section to investigate, and the Council have considered the current proposal on its own merits, having regard to the planning history, prevailing policy context, and all other material considerations.		
Further unauthorised holiday let development is currently in situ on the site.	Any such activity would be a matter for separate investigation under the Council's enforcement section. The current proposal has been considered solely on its own merits, having regard to the planning history, prevailing policy context, and all other material considerations.		
The proposal is contrary to policies TOU 4 and TOU7 of the Plan Strategy.	Concern is raised that the development is contrary to Policies TOU4 & TOU7 of the Plan Strategy. Material weight has been attached to this comment, and it is regarded that the development is contrary to policies TOU4 and TOU7 of the Plan Strategy.		
Dispute over ownership of access lane.	Matters relating to private access rights and land ownership disputes are a civil issue between the parties and are not material planning considerations.		

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

Week Ending 22nd May 2026

Item Number 2			
Application Reference	LA05/2023/0808/F	Date Valid	12.10.2023
Description of Proposal	Site for a two-storey dwelling garage and ancillary siteworks	Location	Lands between 1 Old Forge Mews and Maze Telephone Exchange, Moira Road, Lisburn
Group Recommendation	Refusal	Case Officer	Kevin Maguire
Reasons for Recommendation			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposed development is contrary to criteria (a) of policy HOU3 of the Lisburn and Castlereagh City Council's Plan Strategy in that the development fails to respect the surrounding context and is not appropriate to the character of the site in terms of layout The proposed development is contrary to criteria (b) of policy HOU8 of the Lisburn and Castlereagh City Council's Plan Strategy in that the pattern of development would not be in keeping with the local character of the existing area and existing residential amenity of the established residential area. The proposal is contrary to Policy WM2 of the Lisburn and Castlereagh City Council Plan Strategy, in that it has not been demonstrated that the development proposal would not create or add to a pollution problem or create or add flood risk. 			
Representations			
Objection Letters	Support Letters	Objection Petitions	Support Petitions
	N/A	N/A	N/A
Consideration of Objections			
Issue	Consideration of Issue		
Loss of Privacy.	This is an outline application and full details relating to design including window openings have not been provided at this stage. The indicative site plan provided shows that the proposed dwelling would be set further back into the site and given its relationship with the dwellings at Old Forge Mews is unlikely to result in adverse residential amenity including overlooking or loss of privacy.		
Highway Safety.	As noted, the application is for outline permission and if approved further details would be required at reserved matters stage. DfI Roads were consulted and are content that the proposal would not be contrary to Policies TRA2 or TRA 3 of the LCCC Plan Strategy.		
Parking.	Following the receipt of amended plans DfI Roads were reconsulted and are content at this outline stage, and subject to the submission of further details at reserved matters, that the proposal can provide adequate in-		

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

Week Ending 22nd May 2026

	curtilage parking through the arrangement provided, therefore a reason for refusal on this basis cannot be sustained.
Overbearing / Density.	It is not considered that the proposed 2 storey building on the site would create an unacceptable level of density or be overbearing to the existing dwellings at Old Forge Mews, however it is considered that the proposal would impact on the local character of the immediate area.

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

Week Ending 22nd May 2026

Item Number 3			
Application Reference	LA05/2026/0137/RM	Date Valid	17.02.2026
Description of Proposal	Erection of dwelling, garage and associated siteworks	Location	Land between 5 and 5A Crewe Road, Ballinderry Upper, Lisburn
Group Recommendation	Approval	Case Officer	Catherine Gray
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 the submitted plans.	<p>Concern is raised that the conservatory at No. 5 Crewe Road is not annotated on the submitted site location map, despite appearing on other planning documentation and nearby applications. The objector believes that a revised and accurate site location plan should be submitted to reflect the full footprint of their property including the conservatory and patio so their amenity can be fully appreciated.</p> <p>There is no requirement for the neighbour's sunroom to be annotated on the site location plan. The site location map is used to identify the application site. And the planning unit are aware of the situation on the ground.</p>		
Impact on Residential Amenity and Outlook.	<p>Concern is raised about the relationship between the proposed dwelling and the existing neighbour's bungalow to the north east, about overlooking and loss of amenity. The occupants of number 5 Crewe Road express the view that their amenity values have been enjoyed and relied upon for over 12 years and must be afforded determining weight in accordance with paragraph 4.12 of the SPPS.</p> <p>They also express the view that the proposal would result in demonstrable harm to the amenity of number 5 Crewe Road through overlooking, loss of privacy, visual intrusion and obstruction of outlook. And that the proximity and scale of the proposed development would significantly alter the character of their immediate environment and diminish the enjoyment of their home and garden. They also request that the siting of the proposal be changed.</p> <p>The principle of development has already been established on the site for a dwelling and garage. The proposed dwelling is situated 36 metres</p>		

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

Week Ending 22nd May 2026

	<p>away (building to building) from the neighbours dwelling house at 5 Crewe Road. The proposed garage is 57 metres away from the neighbours dwelling. The proposal has been designed to ensure that there would be no unacceptable overlooking into any neighbours' private amenity space. The proposed design, along with the separation distances, proposed vegetation and difference in level between the two sites ensure that there would be no unacceptable negative impact on any neighbouring private amenity. Obstruction of an outlook is a material consideration that is not given determining weight. It is considered that no demonstrable harm would be caused by the proposal.</p>
<p>Protection of Dark Skies.</p>	<p>The objector expresses the view that the dark skies enjoyed on Crewe Hill were a key factor in their decision to reside in this location and asks for the protection of dark skies. They request that any external lighting associated with the development are strictly controlled by enforceable conditions; in particular no permanently illuminated external lighting should be permitted; all lighting should be motion-activated, and lighting should be low-level and directional to minimise light spill. The view is expressed that this is necessary to prevent light pollution and protect night-time amenity and astronomical observation.</p> <p>The principle for a dwelling at this location has already been accepted and light associated with a domestic dwelling in the countryside is not considered to be light pollution or have a negative impact on any neighbour's amenity. Environmental Health have no objections to the proposal and have raised no concerns with regards to light pollution or amenity.</p>
<p>Landscaping and Screening.</p>	<p>Concern is raised about landscaping and screening. The objector states the following: 'Due to site levels, our bungalow floor level sits approximately 2 metres above boundary level, with eye levels reaching 3-4 metres above the grass level, increasing as the plot dips down towards the farm. Any meaningful screening would therefore require mature planting of at least 4 metres in height at the time of planting. This should be secured by condition, with final positioning agreed on site with us prior to implementation. No planting should be located to the north-west of our property as this would obstruct sunlight and valued views from our conservatory and patio.'</p> <p>The siting of the proposed dwelling is at a lower level than the road level and the neighbouring dwelling of 5 Crewe Road. As you move along the site from the road in a south westerly direction the land level reduces. The ridge height of the proposed dwelling is approximately the same level as the road which the access to the site is from. The proposal is set down in the landscape and designed to make best use of the existing levels. The finished floor level of the dwelling is 7.95 metres lower than the road level, with the dwelling having a ridge height of 8m above the finished floor level.</p>

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

Week Ending 22nd May 2026

	<p>The ridge height of the proposed dwelling is 2.04 metres less than the ridge height of the neighbours dwelling at 5 Crewe Road. The applicant proposes post and wire fencing with native species hedgerows to the new boundaries in keeping with the outline condition along with some additional planting within the site which is considered to be acceptable.</p> <p>The proposal does not need to be invisible from the neighbouring properties. It is considered that the proposal dwelling and garage would integrate sufficiently into the landscape.</p>
Ridge Height.	<p>Concern is raised about ridge height of the proposal. The objector states that 'the ridge height of the proposed new build will stand at 8m two stories in height. This will be only approx. 36m from our windows. This will be imposing and directly affect the surrounding landscape. We request that the ridge height is reduced to 5m.' The objector asks if it would be possible for a 3D image/visual representation to be drawn to show the impact the proposal will have on their property.</p> <p>As described above the levels including the ridge height of the proposal are considered to be acceptable. There was no ridge height condition on the outline approval to restrict the ridge height, it was not considered to be necessary. The proposed two storey dwelling is considered to be acceptable on the site. There is precedent for two storey dwellings in the area and the neighbouring dwelling of number 5a Crewe Road is two storey. There is no requirement for the applicant/agent to submit a 3D drawing as the proposal can be fully assessed on the basis of the information submitted.</p>
Scale, Siting and Layout.	<p>Under concern about scale, siting and layout, the objector requests that the new dwelling is moved to the front of the site in line with number 5B and closer to the road than number 5 resulting in the new dwelling not overlooking number 5 plus 5 and 5a would not overlook the new dwelling; and relocating the detached single-storey garage to the side closest to them. The view is expressed that 'At approximately 34 metres separation (the living room, dining room & conservatory) all of which face the proposed development and contain large windows designed to maximise views, the current scale and massing of the dwelling will have a significant adverse impact on our privacy, outlook and enjoyment of our home by directly overlooking us'.</p> <p>The principle of a dwelling on the site was accepted through the granting is outline planning permission. The siting, scale and layout is considered to be acceptable and ensures that there is no unacceptable impact on any neighbours' private amenity.</p>
Overlooking, Headlight Glare and Boundary Treatment.	<p>Concern is raised that the following should be secured by condition to protect their amenity: any windows with potential to overlook their property to be fitted with obscure glazing and restricted opening; no first floor windows to be permitted in the gable elevation facing their property as per the submitted plans; measures to prevent headlight glare from vehicles, including driveway orientation and screening; a 1.8m high close-boarded timber fence along the southern boundary; restriction of the</p>

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

Week Ending 22nd May 2026

	<p>dwelling to single storey height and control over curtilage extent to prevent encroachment towards their boundary.</p> <p>All of the outline conditions have been met, and no additional conditions can be placed on a Reserved Matters application. It is considered that none of the windows of the proposed dwelling need to be obscure glazing due to the siting and the separation distances. The proposed driveway is along the north western boundary, as far away from the concerned neighbours as possible and is considered to be acceptable. All undefined boundaries are to be defined by a post and wire fence with native species hedgerow in keeping with the outline condition.</p> <p>As discussed above a two-storey dwelling is acceptable on this site at the proposed location. The red line of the application defined the curtilage of the application site.</p>
<p>Protection of Existing Vegetation.</p>	<p>The view is expressed by the occupants of number 5 Crewe Road that their established rambling rose hedge along the front boundary must be retained and protected and that a condition should require protective fencing and safeguards during construction to ensure no damage occurs.</p> <p>The onus is on the developer to ensure that any works undertaken during construction would not have a negative impact on the neighbour's property. A condition relating to neighbouring planting is not considered necessary and would not meet the tests for planning conditions.</p>
<p>Drainage and Environmental Health.</p>	<p>The view is expressed that Environmental Health previously requested detailed foul drainage information, including the location of septic tanks and soakaways for both the proposed and neighbouring properties. And that to their knowledge the information has not been provided and must be submitted and assessed prior to any approval.</p> <p>The information submitted with the application details the proposed method of sewerage disposal (a septic tank) and its proposed location to the southern section of the site. Environmental Health were consulted on the application and did not ask for the additional details referred to above. Environmental Health have no objection to the proposal.</p>
<p>Site Area Discrepancy.</p>	<p>Concern is raised that the size of the site has been reduced raising that, with the Reserved Matters application stating 0.48 hectares, compared to 0.6 hectares in the original outline application. Also, the question is asked, is the site allowed to expand out diagonally behind our site (5 Crewe Road) and should an infill not go between the two adjoining properties?</p> <p>A reduction in site area is accepted by the Council as long as it is within the original approved red line. No demonstrable harm is caused by the reduction of the site area. Any expansion of a site area would require planning permission and is not the subject of this proposal. The proposed dwelling is positioned in between the two adjoining properties, namely number 5 and 5a Crewe Road.</p>

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

Week Ending 22nd May 2026

<p><u>Visibility Splays and Boundary Protection.</u></p>	<p>The view is expressed by the occupants of 5 Crewe Road that they maintain their own boundary fence and roadside grass verge, and that no works should be undertaken to their shrubs or boundary without prior written consent from them and formal direction from DfI Roads. They also state that any visibility requirements must be clearly defined in writing and implemented with their permission and without damage to their property.</p> <p>The submitted information details that the applicant has full ownership of the application site and all lands within the red line. Certificate of Ownership – Certificate A has been signed on the application form. The onus is on the applicant/developer to ensure that they have ownership/control of all lands necessary to implement a planning approval.</p>
<p>Site Meeting / Site Visit.</p>	<p>The occupants of 5 Crewe Road express the view that they would welcome the opportunity for a site meeting at 5 Crewe Road to agree mitigation measures in advance of any determination. The objector also requests that a member/members of the planning committee visit their home to see the impact of the proposed dwelling.</p> <p>As part of the processing of the application a site inspection is carried out in aid with a full and proper assessment of the proposal. There is no requirement for a site meeting. All concerns raised in the representations are dealt with through the processing of the application. With regards to a site visit by the planning committee, the proposal in the first instance will be placed on the delegated list in line with the Council's scheme of delegation and would only be considered by the planning committee if the application is called in to be determined by the planning committee.</p>

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

Week Ending 22nd May 2026

Item Number 4			
Application Reference	LA05/2024/0642/F	Date Valid	03.09.2024
Description of Proposal	Retrospective change of use from previous use (old quarry) to single storey container storage area with associated fencing and hard standing area. Max storage 15 units	Location	Lands opposite 43 Mill Road, Mealough, Belfast
Group Recommendation	Refusal	Case Officer	Callum Henderson
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 the proposed development is not a type of development which in principle is acceptable in the countryside. • The proposal is contrary to Policy ED3 of the Lisburn and Castlereagh City Council Plan Strategy in that the proposed development is not considered to be an expansion of an established economic use in the countryside. • The proposal is contrary to criterion b) of Policy COU15 of the Lisburn and Castlereagh City Council Plan Strategy, in that the proposed development would, if permitted, not be sited to cluster with an established group of buildings. • The proposal is contrary to criterion g) of Policy COU15 of the Lisburn and Castlereagh City Council Plan Strategy, in that the ancillary works at the proposed development do not integrate with their surroundings. • The proposal is contrary to criterion b) of Policy COU16 of the Lisburn and Castlereagh City Council Plan Strategy, in that the proposed development would, if permitted, not be sited to cluster with an established group of buildings • The proposal is contrary to criteria e) and h) of Policy COU16 of the Lisburn and Castlereagh City Council Plan Strategy, in that the proposed development and the impact of ancillary works would, if permitted, have an adverse impact on the rural character of the area. • The proposal is contrary to criterion i) of Policy COU16 of the Lisburn and Castlereagh City Council Plan Strategy, in that it has not been satisfactorily demonstrated that the proposal would not prejudice road safety or significantly inconvenience the flow of traffic. 			

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

Week Ending 22nd May 2026

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposal is contrary to Policy TRA2 of the Lisburn and Castlereagh City Council Plan Strategy, in that it has not been satisfactorily demonstrated that the proposal would not prejudice road safety or significantly inconvenience the flow of vehicles. 			
Representations			
Objection Letters	Support Letters	Objection Petitions	Support Petitions
2	N/A	N/A	N/A
Consideration of Objections			
Issue	Consideration of Issue		
Linkage with the Wrights Centre at Saintfield Road.	It is stated within the objections that access can be gained to the application site from the wider Wrights Repair Centre site, along the Saintfield Road. The objection raises concerns with this precedent and an attempt to link the two sites. It is the lack of a functional link to the Wrights Repair Centre site that forms a reason for refusal of this application with this being considered to be an unacceptable intrusion into the open countryside. In light of this it has not been demonstrated that there is a functional link and thus the proposal would not be considered an expansion of an established economic use in contravention of Policy COU1 and ED3.		
Quarry History.	There is no record or planning history of the site being used as a quarry with no relevant planning history associated with the site. It is thus considered that the existing use is agricultural. The proposal has been assessed as new development within the open countryside, after assessment of the proposal against relevant policies, it is considered 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.		
Lack of Policy support.	It was raised in the objections that there would be a lack of policy support for the proposal. After an assessment against the relevant policies, it is considered 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. Additionally, the proposal is considered to be in contravention of LDP Policies COU15, COU16 and TRA2 as set out in the refusal reasons, owing to a lack of clustering with an established group of buildings, ancillary works not integrating with surroundings, having an adverse impact on rural character and that it has not been satisfactorily demonstrated that the proposal would not prejudice road safety or significantly inconvenience the flow of vehicles.		