

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

Week Ending 11th July 2025

Item Number 1			
Application Reference	LA05/2025/0253/F	Date Valid	07.04.2025
Description of Proposal	Demolition of existing single storey dwelling and erection of new storey and a half replacement dwelling and reconfiguration of existing access arrangements to nos. 3 and 3b Derrynahone Road	Location	3 Derrynahone Road, Moira, Craigavon
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		
Size of dwelling at 1.5 storey.	The proposal is for the replacement of a single storey dwelling with a one and a half storey dwelling house. It is acknowledged that there are different house type within the Settlement Development Limit however directly adjacent and surrounding the application site are 2 storey properties. The proposal for a 1.5 storey dwelling is acceptable in this context. It is designed to have the appearance of a single storey and has upper floor accommodation in the roof with a window to the first floor on each gable end.		
Overlooking into neighbouring garden	The proposal has been designed to ensure that there are no windows that overlook into any neighbour's amenity space. The upper floor gable end window to the western gable is to be obscure glazing.		
Affect sunlight in neighbouring garden.	The positioning, size and scale of the building in relation to the neighbouring properties has been assessed and the light test has been carried out from property number 10 Halfpenny Gate Lane. It is considered that the proposal would not cause any unacceptable loss of light to neighbouring properties.		
Value of property.	The value of property is not a material consideration that is given determining weight.		
Noise and disruption during	Construction works are of a temporary nature and would be present until a development is completed. These are considered to be normal impacts		

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

Week Ending 11th July 2025

construction works.	in relation to the development of land and the issues 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. This would be a civil/legal issue between the relevant parties.
---------------------	---

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

Week Ending 11th July 2025

Item Number 2			
Application Reference	LA05/2022/1122/O	Date Valid	08.12.2022
Description of Proposal	Proposed replacement dwelling and garage	Location	50m NNW of 80 Ballynahinch Road, Dromara, Derry, Down
Group Recommendation	Refusal	Case Officer	Catherine Gray
Reasons for Recommendation			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposal is contrary to Policy NH2 of the Lisburn and Castlereagh City Council Plan Strategy, in that it has not been demonstrated that the development proposal is not likely to harm a European Protected Species. The proposal is contrary to Policy NH5 of the Lisburn and Castlereagh City Council Plan Strategy, in that it has not been demonstrated that the development proposal is not likely to result in the unacceptable adverse impact on, or damage to priority habitats, priority species and features of natural heritage importance. 			
Representations			
Objection Letters	Support Letters	Objection Petitions	Support Petitions
0	N/A	N/A	N/A
Consideration of Objections			
Issue	Consideration of Issue		

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

Week Ending 11th July 2025

Item Number 3			
Application Reference	LA05/2021/0559/F	Date Valid	18.05.2021
Description of Proposal	Development of 24 no apartments, 38 car spaces with car charging points, bike stores, landscape and biodiversity areas and all associated infrastructure and site works.	Location	Site to the south of 7a Lady Wallace Drive, Lisburn
Group Recommendation	Refusal	Case Officer	Catherine Gray
Reasons for Recommendation			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposal is contrary to Policy HOU4 of the Lisburn and Castlereagh City Council Plan Strategy, in that it has not been demonstrated that the proposed site layout indicates safe and convenient access through provision of walking and cycling infrastructure, both within the development and linking to existing and planned networks and meet the needs of mobility impaired persons. The proposal is contrary to Policy TRA1 of the Lisburn and Castlereagh City Council Plan Strategy, in that it has not been demonstrated that the layout of the development proposal incorporates facilities to aid accessibility; user friendly and convenient movement along pathways and an unhindered approach to buildings; and priority pedestrian and cycling movement within and between land uses. The proposal is contrary to Policy NH2 of the Lisburn and Castlereagh City Council Plan Strategy, in that it has not been demonstrated that the development proposal is not likely to harm a European Protected Species. The proposal is contrary to Policy NH5 of the Lisburn and Castlereagh City Council Plan Strategy, in that it has not been demonstrated that the development proposal is not likely to result in the unacceptable adverse impact on, or damage to priority habitats, priority species and features of natural heritage importance. The proposal is contrary to Policy FLD1 of the Lisburn and Castlereagh City Council Plan Strategy, in that it has not been demonstrated that there are adequate measures to manage and mitigate any increase in flood risk arising from the development. 			
Representations			
Objection Letters	Support Letters	Objection Petitions	Support Petitions

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

Week Ending 11th July 2025

52	N/A	N/A	N/A
Consideration of Objections			
Issue	Consideration of Issue		
Environmental/Ecology Impact/Clearance works.	<p>Concern is raised about the destruction of a green space and loss of habitat and its impact on ecology/biodiversity in the area. Concern has been raised that during the processing of the application the site has been cleared of vegetation/habitat, and that the Department for Infrastructure have also recently been carrying out works. And concern is expressed that there are limitations to the ecology information submitted. The question is also asked if the work carried out was authorised?</p> <p>Clearance of a site does not require planning permission. The onus is on the developer/landowner to ensure that they comply with any relevant wildlife/ecology legislation. The submitted ecology information has been considered, and Natural Environment Division (NED) have also been consulted on the proposal. NED advise that in the absence of further information it is contrary to the Plan Strategy. It is also noted that during the processing of the application DfI Rivers Agency have also undertaken works within the application site.</p> <p>It is considered that the proposal is contrary to Policy NH5 Habitats, Species or Features of Natural Heritage Importance of the Lisburn and Castlereagh City Council Plan Strategy, in that it has not been demonstrated that the development proposal is not likely to result in the unacceptable adverse impact on, or damage to priority habitats.</p>		
DAERA consent for landscape removal.	<p>The question is asked if an LF1 (Landscape Removal Form) was completed and permission granted from DAERA for the cutting down of a mature hedgerow by the developer to access the site.</p> <p>The application process referred to is out with the planning process and is a matter for DAERA.</p>		
Land use.	<p>The view is expressed that the existing land use of a green space should be maintained and that it is currently being used as a playground. The view is also expressed that families live in this area so the children can play outside safely but that this new development means that the children are not only going to lose their playground but increase concerns for their safety.</p> <p>The proposed residential use is considered to be a compatible use adjacent to existing residential use, and the site is not a designated children's playground.</p>		
Traffic, access and parking.	<p>The view is expressed that the proposal would increase traffic congestion. That there would be problems especially in an area</p>		

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

Week Ending 11th July 2025

	<p>where there is already gridlock at rush hour. There are concerns about on street parking, if the parking requirement is correct, about the access gradient, and if cars will have a proper view of cars from Lady Wallace Rise/Drive. And the view is expressed that the proposal should include traffic calming measures. The question is also asked if consideration has been given to other access points to the site that does not need to cut through Lady Wallace Drive. The view is also expressed that there is insufficient detail on transportation issues.</p> <p>The proposal is assessed on the basis of the information submitted. A safe access is proposed to the public road and provision is made for car parking in keeping with the Parking Standards. No traffic calming measures are proposed. DfI Roads have been consulted on the development proposal and advise that it is unacceptable in its current form. The proposal has been assessed against the TRA policies and is it considered that the proposal is contrary to Policy TRA1 in that it has not been demonstrated that the layout of the development proposal incorporates facilities to aid accessibility; user friendly and convenient movement along pathways and an unhindered approach to buildings; and priority pedestrian and cycling movement within and between land uses.</p>
Out of character.	<p>The view is expressed that the proposed development is out of character in terms of its appearance compared with existing development in the vicinity, that all the houses are detached and situated in a quiet family orientated area, and that the proposal for apartments is out of character.</p> <p>The Plan Strategy promotes a mix of different types of housing. The proposals design and appearance are in keeping with development in the surrounding area and uses external materials and characteristics from the surrounding development. It is considered that the proposal would not have negative impact on the character of the area.</p>
Density, size and scale of proposal.	<p>The view is expressed that four storey high buildings is not acceptable in this area.</p> <p>The proposal is for 24no. residential units on a site of 0.86 hectares, this is not considered to be over development and the density is in keeping with Policy HOU4. Through the processing of the application, the design of the proposal has been changed to blocks of two and three storey buildings, and is now acceptable in terms of size, height and scale.</p>
Negative impact on existing neighbours.	<p>The view is expressed that the proposal would have an adverse effect on neighbours' residential area in Lady Wallace by loss of privacy, overshadowing, noise and potential vandalism.</p> <p>The development site is situated south of the existing housing development of Lady Wallace. The difference in level and separation</p>

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

Week Ending 11th July 2025

	distances from the existing residential development ensures that there would be no loss of privacy or overshadowing. Residential development adjacent to existing residential development is considered to be compatible uses. The proposal has been assessed against the relevant HOU policies, and it is considered that the proposal would not have a negative impact on existing neighbours by loss of privacy, overshadowing or noise. Potential vandalism is outside the remit of planning.
Loss of view.	<p>Concern is raised that neighbouring residents will loss their view and negatively affect their residential amenity.</p> <p>A view is not a material consideration that is given determining weight. It is considered that the proposal would not have a negative impact on neighbours' private residential amenity.</p>
Noise and air pollution.	<p>Concerns are raised that the development would cause noise and air pollution and impact on resident's health.</p> <p>Environmental Health have been consulted on the proposal and have raised no objections or concerns with regards to noise and air pollution.</p>
Flooding/watercourse.	<p>Concern is raised about potential flooding and about informal meetings between Rivers Agency and the agent. The question asked what evidence would planning need for the developer to prove the development will not cause flooding on the site for it to be approved. The question is asked if the watercourse has been implanted into the developers plans. And the view is expressed that the proposal is contrary to FLD policy. Concern is also raised about the proposed amenity space and boardwalk being within the floodplain.</p> <p>Any private meeting held between the Rivers Agency, and the agent is out with the assessment of this application. The watercourse has been incorporated into the overall proposal. The agent has submitted a Flood Risk Assessment for consideration. Rivers Agency have been consulted and advise that they have no reason to disagree with is conclusions however that the Planning Authority should make the final decision on whether the flood evacuation plan, the proposed development and the scale of intensification of use are acceptable. The proposal has been assessed against the FLD policies. The proposal is contrary to Policy FLD1 Development in Fluvial (River) Flood Plains of the Lisburn and Castlereagh City Council Plan Strategy, in that it has not been demonstrated that there are adequate measures to manage and mitigate any increase in flood risk arising from the development.</p>
Construction works.	The view is expressed that the construction will contribute to pollution of the environment and that it would cause disruption to neighbouring residents. The view is expressed that should the proposal be approved, it would be expected that the applicant and developer

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

Week Ending 11th July 2025

	<p>liaise closely with the residents of Lady Wallace Drive during construction and completion, given its access location, the scale of the development, the time required for construction and that the road at Lady Wallace Drive has yet to be adopted, and asks that this also be conditioned. The objectors are also keen to understand a timeline for commencement of the development and seek assurances from the developer to maintain the current access and cleanliness of the road surface to Lady Wallace Drive.</p> <p>Environmental Health have been consulted and have raised no concerns with regards to pollution. Construction works are of a temporary nature and would be present until a development is completed. These are considered to be normal impacts in relation to the development of land and the issues 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. This would be a civil/legal issue between the relevant parties. With regards to a timeline for commencement of development, if the development is approved, a condition would be placed on for the development to be commenced within 5 years from the date of approval.</p>
Unfinished development.	<p>Concern is raised that any new development may be left unfinished in much the same way as Woodbrook which has taken 10 years to come to fruition. The view is expressed that they do not wish to have unfinished development in close proximity to a well-established and maintained development and asks for assurances with regards to the financial viability of the project.</p> <p>The capital required to construct a development is not a material planning consideration. This is a matter for the owner/developer. The potential future failing of a business/development is not part of the assessment of this planning proposal.</p>
Neighbour notification.	<p>The question is asked how many times neighbours will be asked to respond to changes in plans or new documentation. And concern is raised that neighbours in Lady Wallace Rise have not been notified by planning. The view is also expressed that neighbour notification letters are issues when the planning office have in their opinion secured enough information to enable residents to make informed comments.</p> <p>The Council has fulfilled its statutory obligations with regards to neighbour notification. Re-neighbour notification has taken place when amended plans / additional information has been submitted for consideration, to allow neighbours to make comment/further comment should they wish to do so.</p>

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

Week Ending 11th July 2025

Contrary to policies PPS 7 and PPS 2.	<p>Concern is expressed that the proposal does not comply with PPS 7 and PPS 2.</p> <p>PPS 7 and PPS 2 have been superseded by the Lisburn and Castlereagh City Council Plan Strategy of which the proposal has been assessed against the relevant policies.</p>
Response to consultees.	<p>The question is asked why the agent has not responded to issues raised by consultees.</p> <p>The agent has been asked to address any outstanding issues raised by consultees; however not all issues have been addressed. The Council has determined the application on the basis of information submitted to date.</p>
Site History.	<p>The view is expressed that the history on the site of the rejection of planning permission S/2011/0049/O is noted and asks how could a planning application even broader in scope be allowed to pass no, when the objections noted previously are likely to remain in situ, not taking into account the works already undertaken by the Department of Infrastructure since.</p> <p>The planning history is material consideration that is taken on board during the processing of the application. Application S/2011/0049/O was for the erection of a three-storey nursing care facility that was refused. This proposal is for 24no. residential units. Each application is assessed on its own merits against the relevant prevailing planning policy.</p>
Checks on the development.	<p>The question is asked if any checks are carried out to see if the developer is/has undertaken works in accordance with relevant approvals/reports.</p> <p>The Council do not have the resources to provide checks on all developments. The onus is on the developer to ensure that he complies with all relevant permissions, if the development is approved. Should the development not be built in accordance with the approved plans, then the matter can be referred to the Enforcement Team within the Council for investigation.</p>
Construction on the site.	<p>The view is expressed that a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) should be required to be submitted, as this is good practice and was suggested by the PAC commissioner for the previous nursing home application. Another objector expresses concern about the content of the submitted CEMP.</p> <p>A Construction Environmental Management Plan has been submitted for consideration. NIEA have been consulted on the proposal,</p>

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

Week Ending 11th July 2025

	however they have asked for additional information to be detailed in the CEMP and this has not been submitted by the agent to date.
Adoption of Lady Wallace Drive.	<p>The question is asked if Lady Wallace Drive has been adopted by Roads Service yet and if not, does it need to be adopted before this construction takes place?</p> <p>Adoption of a road by DfI Roads is outside the remit of planning.</p>
Access by Emergency Services.	<p>The view is expressed that the apartment blocks do not clearly show how access can be provided for emergency services for example in the case of a fire.</p> <p>The proposal would be built to building control standards that would include provision for emergency services to gain access to the buildings.</p>
Landscaping.	<p>The view is expressed that the revised application does not detail any plans for landscaping in and around the proposed site.</p> <p>A landscaping plan has been submitted for consideration.</p>
Planning Portal.	<p>The view is expressed that the Planning Portal would not allow them to submit their objection online stating that it was not accepting any public comments and that this was very disappointing.</p> <p>Representations can be received up until a decision is made on an application and this can be done in various ways, by e-mail, in hard copy or online through the Planning Portal.</p>
Understanding of the submission/not enough information.	<p>The view is expressed that the system is not supportive of the general public who do not have the expertise or understanding to be able to go through plans. And that it would be greatly beneficial if the notification letters actually stated what has changed or what document has been added that they need to look at. And another objector raises concerns that there is not enough information submitted to make an informed decision.</p> <p>The plans and documents submitted are standard for an application for this type of proposal with the number of constraints on the application site. Re-neighbour notification letters advise when there has been amended plans or additional information submitted for consideration. The application is determined on the basis of the information submitted to date.</p>
Playparks / community facilities / recreational space.	The view is expressed that they understand that the communal amenity space is for private communal space for the residents of this development only. The view is expressed that there is a severe lack of amenity and community facility space for residents and families of

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

Week Ending 11th July 2025

	<p>Thaxton Village. They ask for the applicant to consider this when proposing further residential development in the area. And they quote policy HOU5. The view is also expressed that the information is lacking on what the public amenity space consists of. The view is expressed that the proposed recreational space is of little value.</p> <p>The proposed private amenity space for this development complies with the guidance in Creating Places. The proposal is for 24no. residential units and the site does not exceed one hectare. As such public open space does not need to be provided as part of this development, however they have provided a total of 1507 square metres of public amenity space as part of the development. The layout plan clearly annotates the proposed amenity space and is considered to be acceptable.</p>
Advice from Architects.	<p>The view is expressed that on the Planning Portal Manor Architects have responded to some of the issues raised and that if unsolicited should not have any bearing on discussions by the planners.</p> <p>All information submitted are material considerations that are considered as part of the processing of the application.</p>