

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

**Week Ending 6th February 2026**

| Item Number 1   |   |                            |                                   |
|---|---|----------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| <b>Application Reference</b>  | LA05/2023/0760/F  | <b>Date Valid</b>          | 25.09.2023                        |
| <b>Description of Proposal</b>  | Development of building and external servicing area to serve existing businesses with external site works (Retrospective).  | <b>Location</b>            | 11 Old Ballynahinch Road, Lisburn |
| <b>Group Recommendation</b>   | Approval  | <b>Case Officer</b>        | Michael Vladeanu                  |
| 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>          |
| 3   | N/A   | N/A                        | N/A                               |
| Consideration of Objections   |   |                            |                                   |
| <b>Issue</b>  | <b>Consideration of Issue</b>   |                            |                                   |
| Works have been completed without planning permission.                      | The Council acknowledges that the development was carried out prior to the submission of this application. However, the Planning Act (NI) 2011 allows retrospective planning applications to be determined in the same manner as applications for proposed development.   |                            |                                   |
| Flood risk from hardstanding, infilling and development over a watercourse. | <p>Concern regarding flood risk has been fully assessed through consultation with DFI Rivers and consideration of the submitted Drainage Assessment prepared by Lisbane Consultants, a competent drainage engineer.</p> <p>DFI Rivers have confirmed that the site is not located within the fluvial floodplain and that the works affecting the culvert were authorised by their Eastern Division under ref: IN1-22-12232 dated 11<sup>th</sup> October 2022.</p> <p>On the basis of the drainage assessment submitted, the Council is satisfied that the development does not increase flood risk on-site or elsewhere and would be subject to conditions limiting run off rates from the site to those outlined in the Drainage Assessment. As such the proposal complies with Policy FLD3 of the Plan Strategy.</p> |                            |                                   |
| Conflict with Policies FLD2 and FLD4.                                       | In this case, DFI Rivers issued a Schedule 6 consent (IN1-22-12232 dated 11 <sup>th</sup> October 2022) for the culverting works beneath the building. As the culvert is located entirely within the applicant's landholding, DFI Rivers confirmed that future maintenance responsibility lies with the   |                            |                                   |

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

**Week Ending 6th February 2026**

|  |   |
|--|---|
|  | <p>applicant. Given the existence of lawful consent and that the watercourse remains accessible across the remainder of the route, the proposal does not conflict with Policy FLD2.</p> <p>Policy FLD4 relates to works which would alter, divert or modify a watercourse. The development does not involve any further works to the culvert or open sections of the watercourse beyond what was already authorised by DFI Rivers. As no further modification is proposed, Policy FLD4 is not engaged.</p>  |
| Culvert diameter discrepancy.                          | The culvert arrangement was reviewed and approved by DFI Rivers as part of the Schedule 6 consent process. There is therefore no planning or drainage objection arising from this matter.   |
| Validity and scope of DFI Rivers consent IN1-22-12232. | <p>DFI Rivers have been made aware of the objections raised in relation to the Schedule 6 consent, including the suggestion that it did not authorise the culvert works beneath the building. DFI Rivers have confirmed that Schedule 6 Consent reference IN1-22-12232 dated 11<sup>th</sup> October 2022 was granted for the culverting works affecting the undesignated watercourse at this location.</p> <p>Schedule 6 Consent is the statutory mechanism for the Drainage (NI) Order 1973 for authorising works to a watercourse, including culverting. The granting of that consent confirms DFI Rivers are satisfied with the design and location of the culvert.</p> <p>While Schedule 6 consent does not grant planning permission for the building or associated hardstanding, it does confirm that the watercourse works themselves have been lawfully authorised by the competent drainage authority. The planning acceptability of the development is therefore considered through this application, taking into account the existence of that consent and the Drainage Assessment submitted in support of the application.</p> |

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

**Week Ending 6th February 2026**

| Item Number 2  |   |                            |                                  |
|--|---|----------------------------|----------------------------------|
| <b>Application Reference</b>                                       | LA05/2025/0779/F  | <b>Date Valid</b>          | 29.10.2025                       |
| <b>Description of Proposal</b>                                     | Part Single Part Two Storey Rear Extension  | <b>Location</b>            | 9 Queensfort Park South, Belfast |
| <b>Group Recommendation</b>  | Approval  | <b>Case Officer</b>        | Jordan Campbell                  |
| 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>   |                            |                                  |
| Incomplete and Inaccurate Plans.                                   | It is acknowledged that the plans originally submitted were incomplete and contained inaccuracies. These included the omission of the rear extension at No. 38 Blenheim Park, approved and built under LA05/2019/0051/F, as well as the omission of a proposed first-floor bathroom window on the side elevation of the applicant's dwelling. Revised plans addressing these issues were subsequently submitted. Neighbouring properties were re-notified and afforded a further opportunity to provide comments or lodge objections.   |                            |                                  |
| Overlooking and Loss of Privacy.                                   | It is noted that the proposed two-storey rear extension would reduce the boundary separation from approximately 15.5m to approximately 11.1m and the window-to-window distance between No. 9 and No. 38 from 25.5 to 20.1m. The development would additionally introduce three new first-floor windows: a rear-facing bedroom window, a rear-facing obscure-glazed ensuite window, and an obscure-glazed bathroom window on the northeast-facing side elevation. Given the proposed ensuite and bathroom windows would be obscure-glazed, they would not result in any loss of privacy or additional overlooking. Whilst the proposed development would reduce existing separation distances and introduce an additional first-floor bedroom window to the rear elevation, it is considered that this would not create any new opportunities for overlooking beyond those that already exist. No. 38 Blenheim Park's rear windows and garden area are already subject to a degree of overlooking from No. 9's existing first-floor bedroom window. Accordingly, the proposal would not materially alter the established relationship between the two properties, and the overall impact on privacy would remain broadly unchanged. Given the urban context and current degree of overlooking, the proposed development would not result in an |                            |                                  |

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

**Week Ending 6th February 2026**

|   |  |
|---|--|
|   | unacceptable level of overlooking and loss of privacy to sustain a refusal reason.   |
| Overbearing and Visually Intrusive Structure.                 | It is acknowledged that the proposed rear extension would result in an increased degree of structural massing. However, the proposed extension would be clearly subordinate to the host dwelling, through being set down 0.8 m from the main ridge line, and with a floor area of 52 m <sup>2</sup> compared to the original dwelling's 78 m <sup>2</sup> , the proposal would remain proportionately subordinate. Further, any potential adverse impact in terms of visual intrusiveness or domineering presence on No. 38 Blenheim Park would be significantly mitigated through the retained separation distances. The retained spatial buffer is sufficient to reduce the perceived scale of the development and limit any undue sense of enclosure. |
| Overshadowing and Loss of Daylight.                           | Given the orientation and existing spatial relationship between the application site and the surrounding properties, together with the natural arc of the sun, the proposal is not expected to result in any notable overshadowing or material loss of daylight to neighbouring dwellings or garden areas.   |
| Not In keeping with the character and appearance of Locality. | The proposed two-storey rear extension is not considered an incongruous form of development. Other dwellings within the locality have benefited from two storey rear and side extensions, namely No.5 and No.8 Queensfort Park South. Therefore, the proposed extension is considered acceptable in principle. Further, given the context, the proposed development would not appear out of character within the locality, nor would it harmfully impact on the appearance of the locality.  |

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

**Week Ending 6th February 2026**

| Item Number 3  |  |                            |  |
|--|--|----------------------------|--|
| <b>Application Reference</b>                                       | LA05/2023/0017/F   | <b>Date Valid</b>          | 16.02.2023                             |
| <b>Description of Proposal</b>                                     | Proposed extension and change of use from non-listed vernacular outbuilding to dwelling  | <b>Location</b>            | Lands west of 21 Glenavy Road, Lisburn |
| <b>Group Recommendation</b>  | Approval   | <b>Case Officer</b>        | Joseph Billham                         |
| 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>  |                            |  |
| Block out natural light to property.                               | The extension at the rear of the building is set off the shared boundary by 3.6m. The agent has carried out a loss of light test which is seen as being met. There shall be no adverse impact on loss of light on the adjacent property.   |                            |  |
| Impact on privacy.   | At first floor level on the side elevation there are two new windows facilitating the landing and stairs that face the boundary shared with No 21. The rooms are not considered to be habitable rooms and therefore the windows can be conditioned to be fitted with obscured glazing. The remaining dwellings in the surrounding area have a sufficient separation distance to mitigate any privacy concerns. |                            |  |
| Impact on noise from residents moving in.                          | The proposal does not include alterations such as a balcony, roof terrace or high-level decking. There is another dwelling in situ at the bottom of the laneway. The impact on noise shall not be unduly when taking into account the surrounding area.  |                            |  |
| Encroach into my property.   | The existing building as part of the conversion is already connected to No 21 Glenavy Road. The extension at the rear of the building is set of the boundary by 3.6m and shall not encroach.   |                            |  |
| Devalue my property.   | Devaluation of property is not a material consideration that is given determining weight.  |                            |  |
| Access to boundary walls for works.                                | Gaining access to boundary walls for development is outside the remit of planning and is a civil matter.   |                            |  |