

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

**Week Ending 27 September 2024**

<b>Item Number 1</b>			
<b>Application Reference</b>	LA05/2022/0910/F	<b>Date Valid</b>	05.10.2022
<b>Description of Proposal</b>	Proposed change of house type from previous approval LA05/2023/0788/RM	<b>Location</b>	Site 30m west of 16a Drumcill Road, Lisburn BT28 2TG
<b>Group Recommendation</b>	Approval	<b>Case Officer</b>	Laura McCausland
<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>
<b>3</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>N/A</b>
<b>Consideration of Objections</b>			
<b>Issue</b>	<b>Consideration of Issue</b>		
Address incorrect	<p>The view is expressed that the address is incorrect as Drumcill Road is not in Royal Hillsborough.</p> <p>An amended P1 form was submitted to reflect correct address, and the application was readvertised and re-neighbour notified</p>		
Road Safety and Traffic concern	<p>Concern is expressed that the road is narrow with potholes and Road Services fail to take appropriate measures to deal with increased traffic.</p> <p>DFI Roads have been consulted and offer no objection to the proposed development. It is deemed that the proposal is in accordance with Policy TRA2.</p>		

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

**Week Ending 27 September 2024**

Item Number 2			
<b>Application Reference</b>	LA05/2021/0664/F	<b>Date Valid</b>	14.06.2021
<b>Description of Proposal</b>	Proposal to provide a 4 bedroom detached dwelling with amenity space and new site access	<b>Location</b>	Site adjacent to 34 Groganstown, Lisburn, BT17 0NR
<b>Group Recommendation</b>	Refusal	<b>Case Officer</b>	Cara Breen
Reasons for Recommendation			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The proposal is contrary to Policy COU1 of the Lisburn and Castlereagh City Council Plan Strategy, in that it is not a type of development which in principle is considered to be acceptable in the countryside.</li> <li>▪ The proposal is contrary to Policy COU2 of the Lisburn and Castlereagh City Council Plan Strategy, in that the cluster of development does not appear as a visual entity in the local landscape, the cluster is not associated with a focal point, the identified site is not bound on at least two sides with other development in the cluster and development of the site would not be absorbed into the existing cluster through rounding off and consolidation, it would visually intrude into the open countryside through the creation of ribbon development.</li> <li>▪ The proposal is contrary to Policy COU8 of the Lisburn and Castlereagh City Council Plan Strategy, in that the proposed development would, if permitted, create a ribbon of development on Groganstown.</li> <li>▪ The proposal is contrary Policy COU15 of the Lisburn and Castlereagh City Council Plan Strategy, in that the proposed ancillary works do not integrate with their surroundings.</li> <li>▪ The proposal is contrary to 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, it would have an adverse impact on the rural character of the area and the impact of ancillary works would have an adverse impact on rural character.</li> </ul>			
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 27 September 2024**

Item Number 3			
<b>Application Reference</b>	LA05/2023/0246/O	<b>Date Valid</b>	16.03.2023
<b>Description of Proposal</b>	Proposed dwelling within an existing small gap in a substantially built up frontage	<b>Location</b>	Between 116a and 118 Saintfield Road, Lisburn, BT27 5PG
<b>Group Recommendation</b>	Refusal	<b>Case Officer</b>	Cara Breen
Reasons for Recommendation			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The proposal is contrary to Policy COU1 of the Lisburn and Castlereagh City Council Plan Strategy, in that it is not a type of development which in principle is considered to be acceptable in the countryside.</li> <li>▪ The proposal is contrary to Policy COU8 of the Lisburn and Castlereagh City Council Plan Strategy, in that the development, if approved, would create a ribbon of development along Saintfield Road. Furthermore, there is not a small gap sufficient to accommodate two dwellings within a substantial and continuously built up frontage and the proposal would not respect the existing pattern of development in terms of siting, nor would it be appropriate to the existing size, scale, plot size and width.</li> <li>▪ The proposal is contrary to Policy COU16 of the Lisburn and Castlereagh City Council Plan Strategy, in that the proposed development does not respect the traditional pattern of settlement exhibited in that area, it would result in an adverse impact on the rural character of the area, and it has not been demonstrated that access to the public road cannot be achieved without prejudice to road safety or significantly inconveniencing the flow of traffic.</li> <li>▪ The proposal is contrary to Policy TRA2 of the Lisburn and Castlereagh City Council Plan Strategy, in that it has not been demonstrated that the proposal would not prejudice road safety or significantly inconvenience the flow of vehicles, and it does not conflict with Policy TRA3 Access to Protected Routes.</li> <li>▪ The proposal is contrary to Policy FLD1 of the Lisburn and Castlereagh City Council Plan Strategy, in that it has not been demonstrated that the development could be accommodated within a part of the application site that is found to be outside the determined fluvial floodplain, nor has it been demonstrated that the proposal constitutes an exception to the policy.</li> </ul>			

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

**Week Ending 27 September 2024**

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proposal is contrary to Policy FLD2 of the Lisburn and Castlereagh City Council Plan Strategy, in that it has not been demonstrated that the development would not hinder access for maintenance to the watercourse.</li> </ul>			
Representations			
Objection Letters	Support Letters	Objection Petitions	Support Petitions
2	N/A	N/A	N/A
Consideration of Objections			
Issue	Consideration of Issue		
No 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). Those neighbours which require neighbour notification as per statutory obligation have been verified via an internal system and as part of the site inspection process.		
Objector raises concerns about the way applications are determined and fairness	Each Planning application is determined on its own merits and is assessed in accordance with prevailing Planning policy and guidance and all other material considerations.		
Reference to neighbouring developments	Each Planning application is determined on its own merits and is assessed in accordance with prevailing Planning policy and guidance and all other material considerations		
No substantial and continuously built up frontage	As per Refusal Reason 2, it is acknowledged that there is no substantial and continuously built up frontage as defined by and for the purposes of Policy COU8 of the Lisburn and Castlereagh City Council Plan Strategy.		
COU8 requires the building on either side to be 'inter-visible'	A prerequisite of Policy COU8 of the Lisburn and Castlereagh City Council is that the buildings within a substantial and continuously built up frontage are visually linked. Whilst it is acknowledged that there is no substantial and continuously built up frontage present on the ground in relation to this application, for the purposes of completeness this policy test was assessed based on the buildings either side of the application site and it was found that there is no visual linkage between them given the dense vegetation to the north eastern and south western boundaries of the application site.		

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

**Week Ending 27 September 2024**

Item Number 4			
<b>Application Reference</b>	LA05/2024/0591/F	<b>Date Valid</b>	13.08.2024
<b>Description of Proposal</b>	Single storey rear extension to provide tenant with shower room, bedroom, and wheelchair accessible kitchen. The works will also include level access to both the front and rear of the property.	<b>Location</b>	50 Holly Mount, Dunmurry, Belfast, BT17 9QD
<b>Group Recommendation</b>	Approval	<b>Case Officer</b>	Emma Forde
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			
<b>Issue</b>	<b>Consideration of Issue</b>		
The applicant does not reside at the property	Objectors' comments raise concerns regarding whether the applicant resides at the property. It is not required that the applicant resides at the property. Furthermore, documents have been submitted which are addressed to the applicant and have the site address listed as their address. As such, this is not of concern in regard to the granting of planning permission.		
The property has a ground floor apartment	Concerns were also raised regarding the property being divided into apartments. Following a site visit, there was no evidence found to support this claim.		
Damage to Roads during construction	Concern is expressed that damage will be caused to the roads and footpaths.  Noise, damage to roads and footpaths, and access to neighbouring sites as a result of the construction process were raised as concerns within the submitted objections. The onus is on the applicant to ensure no disturbances are caused outside of standard construction hours. As such noise resulting from construction is not a planning consideration, and so		

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

**Week Ending 27 September 2024**

	has not been considered as a material consideration in the decision-making process of this application.
Impact on a concrete shed which is linked to the application site	Regarding the concern surrounding the impact on the neighbour's outbuilding which shares a wall with the outbuilding, which is to be demolished, while the plans state that the applicants will 'make good' the neighbours shed, this is a part all issue. As such it is noted planning matter and does not form part of the planning decision making process.
The plans are unclear	Objectors also claim that the plans are unclear however, following review of the plans, they are deemed to be clear and acceptable.

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

**Week Ending 27 September 2024**

Item Number 5			
<b>Application Reference</b>	LA05/2022/0969/F	<b>Date Valid</b>	19.10.2022
<b>Description of Proposal</b>	Propose storey and a half garage	<b>Location</b>	18 Eglantine Demense Road, Royal Hillsborough
<b>Group Recommendation</b>	Approval	<b>Case Officer</b>	Laura McCausland
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>
6	N/A	N/A	N/A
Consideration of Objections			
Issue	Consideration of Issue		
Character	<p>Third parties state express concern that the garage will not to be in keeping with or reflective of the wider development and it will detract from the overall aspect of the development. No other courtyard cottages have garages.</p> <p>There is a Listed Property in eyeline of the proposed building.” <i>During the site inspection it was noted that other garden sheds and storage areas were sited to the rear of other properties. HED were consulted and offer no objection to the proposal in relation to the proposal's; scale, design, material finish or impact on setting of listed building.</i></p> <p>The design is considered to be suitable at this location and will not detract with the character of the existing property and surrounding development which is in keeping with criteria (a) of policy HOU 07.</p>		
Design	<p>Third parties raised concern regarding the size and volume of garage shown on plans in that they seem excessive and disproportionate in relation to the house and placement of house within the site. They consider the proposal to be in keeping with an outbuilding as a detached rural single dwelling and that the red brick is inappropriate.</p> <p>HED were consulted and consider all material finish to be acceptable.</p> <p>The agent has provided coloured existing and proposed perspectives from critical views, on consideration of these and proposed plans it is considered that proposed development is subordinate to the property and design, height and massing considered to be suitable at this location</p>		

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

**Week Ending 27 September 2024**

	<p>when viewed with surrounding development which is in keeping with criteria (a) of policy HOU 07.</p>
Visual Impact	<p>Third parties consider the sloping nature of the site and ground level difference between properties new plans would detrimentally impact visual aspect of multiple properties (4,6 &amp;20)</p> <p>On consideration of topography exhibited at this location land falls slightly in a east to west direction. The proposed development has been designed and sympathetically sited to achieve suitable separation distances between neighbouring properties so that the proposed development will not appear to be dominant or have an overbearing impact on any surrounding residential amenity.</p> <p>Design and scale are not considered to be at odds with surrounding development.</p> <p>Whilst the loss of a view is a material planning consideration it has not been given determining weight in this instance.</p>
Enforcement Case	<p>Breach of planning conditions is a matter for the Enforcement section of Council and not a material consideration that carries weight in the assessment of this application.</p>
Road Safety	<p>the proposed building will block light and visibility of motor vehicles from lane/road access and dangerous access.</p> <p>DFI Roads have been consulted and offer on objection to the development in relation to the proposed development and access arrangements. Therefore the proposal is considered to comply with criteria (d) of policy HOU7 and TRA2.</p>
Precedent	<p>If approved 7/8 properties will squeeze garages and ancillary accommodation to the back garden.</p> <p>The proposal site is considered to be of sufficient size to absorb the proposed development whilst still affording sufficient usable amenity area for the property. Each application would be assessed in its own merits.</p>
Planning History	<p>The objection states that a previous single storey garage was refused, and the reasons should still apply.</p> <p>A planning history search has been carried out and Council confirm that no previous planning application for a single storey garage has been submitted on the site. The Enforcement case relates to a subfloor of a single storey garage. All applications are assessed in their own individual merits.</p> <p>This application is considered to comply with criteria (a)- (d) of policy HOU7 thus is acceptable.</p>



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

**Week Ending 27 September 2024**

<p>Over looking into front garden of number 4.</p>	<p>It is acknowledged that within housing developments and surrounding development that there will be some degree of overlooking between neighbouring properties.</p> <p>Proposed windows to the proposed rear elevation are to be velux. The proposed external staircase to the side of the proposed development is approximately 35m from the property No.4. this is considered to be an appropriate separation distance between the proposed development and property No. 4 to ensure there will be no overlooking, loss of light or loss of privacy.</p> <p>Due to the orientation of No.4 (front facing into the rear of the proposal site) in relation to sympathetic siting of the proposed garage it is deemed all views from the proposed development onto private amenity area of No. 4 will be obscured by No. 4 itself. The proposal is deemed to comply with criteria (c) of HOU 07.</p>
--	---

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

**Week Ending 27 September 2024**

Item Number 6			
<b>Application Reference</b>	LA05/2024/0048/F	<b>Date Valid</b>	
<b>Description of Proposal</b>	Erection of sunroom to rear of dwelling	<b>Location</b>	20 Woodbrook Meadows, Lisburn, BT28 0AE
<b>Group Recommendation</b>	Approve	<b>Case Officer</b>	Laura McCausland
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			
<b>Issue</b>	<b>Consideration of Issue</b>		
Impact on natural light	<p>The third property considers the proposed development to impact upon natural light to their property.</p> <p>The agent has provided a drawing indicating sunlight pathway that demonstrates due to separation distance from the proposed development that the proposal will not create potential for loss of light to objector's property. Due to the orientation and separation distance between the proposed development and the objectors' property it is deemed that the proposal complies with policy HOU7 in that the proposed development will not negatively impact upon any residential amenity.</p>		
Development impact on view	<p>Third party purchased their property due to greater views than other locations in Woodbrook.</p> <p>The proposed design, scale, site layout and proposed development has been considered within the context of the existing property and surrounding development and It is regarded that the proposed development will not create a detrimental impact on any neighbouring residential amenity or property</p>		
Privacy	<p>The third property considers the proposed development to create loss of privacy upon their residential amenity.</p> <p>The single storey development is approximately 10m from the rear of the objector's property. Existing boundary treatment of 1.8m high timber close boarded fence between proposal site and objector's property will remain as existing therefore will be unchanged by the proposal. Due to the proposed modest scale of proposed development that would reflect permitted development that has been sympathetic sited to afford suitable</p>		



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

**Week Ending 27 September 2024**

	separation distance from objectors property of 10m therefore the proposed development is not considered to unduly affect privacy of any neighbouring property and policy HOU 7 criteria (b) has been met.
--	---