

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

Week Ending 13th February 2026

Item Number 1			
Application Reference	LA05/2025/0624/F	Date Valid	28.08.2025
Description of Proposal	Retrospective application for erection of a single two storey dwelling	Location	8 Moybrick Road, Dromara, Dromore
Group Recommendation	Approval	Case Officer	Michael Vladeanu
Reasons for Recommendation			
All relevant planning material considerations have been satisfied.			
Representations			
Objection Letters	Support Letters	Objection Petitions	Support Petitions
2	N/A	N/A	N/A
Consideration of Objections			
Issue	Consideration of Issue		
Loss of Privacy/Overlooking.	<p>The development has been assessed against Policy HOU4(i) and Policy HOU8, having regard to the Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance and the privacy guidance contained within Creating Places. It is acknowledged that the dwelling has been constructed with a revised siting when compared to the previously approved scheme under LA05/2021/0479/F, and that this has reduced separation distances to adjoining boundaries and neighbouring properties.</p> <p>In respect of No. 8 Moybrick Road, the side-facing first-floor windows closest to the shared boundary serve non-habitable accommodation (landing/bathroom). To prevent any overlooking, it is considered necessary and reasonable to require these windows to be obscure glazed and retained as such. Subject to this mitigation, the development would not result in an unacceptable loss of privacy to No. 8.</p> <p>Regarding Nos. 26 and 27 Woodvale Green, it is acknowledged that the as-built dwelling is closer than the previously approved dwelling however, even under the approved scheme a degree of intervisibility between upper-floor windows and neighbouring rear gardens would be typical in this established residential context, albeit at increased separation under the previously approved arrangement. However, the relationship between properties is not directly in line back-to-back orientation rather, the views are oblique due to the relative orientation and window arrangement and are experienced in the context of</p>		

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

Week Ending 13th February 2026

	intervening boundary treatments and the difference in levels (with Woodvale Green positioned higher). The separation achieved between the buildings, together with the fact that any views are not directly aligned into principal rear habitable rooms, means the impact would not be as significant as to constitute an unacceptable loss of privacy when judged against Policies HOU4(i) and HOU8.
Siting/orientation and rear openings (including widened rear openings/doors).	The objection refers to the siting/orientation of the dwelling and the form of openings on the rear elevation. It is noted that the rear elevation incorporates patio doors at ground floor level, which provide access to the applicant's private rear amenity space. As these openings are at ground floor level, any outward views are primarily into the host site and rear garden area. In addition, the adjoining properties at Woodvale Green are positioned at a higher ground level relative to the application site, and existing boundary treatments are in place along the rear boundaries. As such, the rear ground-floor patio doors are not considered to give rise to an unacceptable overlooking impact or loss of privacy to neighbouring properties.
Loss of light / overshadowing.	<p>Overshadowing and loss of light concerns have been considered having regard to the siting, scale and orientation of the dwelling, and the separation distances between properties. In respect of Nos. 26 and 27 Woodvale Green, it is noted that these properties sit at a higher level than the application site and the separation between the dwellings is such that the proposal is not considered to give rise to an unacceptable loss of light, overshadowing or an overbearing impact.</p> <p>In respect of No. 8 Moybrick Road, having regard to the orientation, the separation to the common boundary, and the intervening boundary treatment, the development is not considered to appear unduly dominant or overbearing, nor to result in unacceptable loss of light to adjacent habitable rooms or private amenity space.</p>
Inaccuracies/omissions on plans.	The objections raise concerns regarding inaccuracies/omissions on the originally submitted drawings. During the processing of the application, amended plans were requested and subsequently submitted (including Drawing No. 01/2) to clarify the as-built arrangement and address the matters raised. The application has been assessed on the basis of the amended drawings and the development as constructed and observed on site.
Neighbour Notification Concerns.	Neighbour notification and publicity were undertaken in accordance with statutory requirements. Neighbour notification letters were issued on 19 November 2025 to the following properties: No. 8 Moybrick Road, No. 9 Bridge Cottages, Nos. 25–27 Woodvale Green, and No. 1 Moybrick Grove. In addition, the application was publicised by press advertisement for the period 12 September 2025 to 26 September 2025. Objections were received and the issues raised have been fully considered as part of the assessment.
Precedent / confidence in the planning system.	Each planning application must be determined on its own merits having regard to the Development Plan and material considerations. The retrospective nature of the application has been acknowledged

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

Week Ending 13th February 2026

	however retrospective applications can be granted where the development is considered acceptable in planning terms. The recommendation is based on the acceptability of the dwelling as constructed against the relevant policy tests and material considerations.
Devaluation of property.	The potential effect of a development on property values is not a material planning consideration and therefore carries no weight in the determination of this application.
Dwelling not built in accordance with approved plans/conditions.	It is acknowledged that the dwelling has not been constructed in accordance with the drawings approved under LA05/2021/0479/F and that the current application is retrospective. The assessment for this application is whether the dwelling as built is acceptable against the Development Plan and material considerations. Matters relating to compliance with a previous approval are separate to the determination of this retrospective application.
Wrong alignment of dwelling.	The dwelling's orientation and set-back siting have been considered in the context of the mixed built form along this part of Moybrick Road and the surrounding residential area. While it differs from the previously approved layout, the dwelling remains comparable in scale and does not appear visually incongruous or harmful to the character of the area when assessed against Policies HOU3 and HOU4.

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

Week Ending 13th February 2026

Item Number 2			
Application Reference	LA05/2025/0443/F	Date Valid	19.06.2025
Description of Proposal	Retrospective amendment to LA05/2023/0332/F comprising the erection of a rear veranda, conversion of double garage to single garage and bedroom with ensuite. Construction of a single storey side extension, alterations to all fenestration, addition and modification of doors, changes to rainwater goods, revisions to external wall finishes, installation of solar panels to roof, with new fencing and planting.	Location	6 Elmwood Park, Lisburn
Group Recommendation	Approval	Case Officer	Jordan Campbell
Reasons for Recommendation			
All relevant planning material considerations have been satisfied.			
Representations			
Objection Letters	Support Letters	Objection Petitions	Support Petitions
12	N/A	N/A	N/A
Consideration of Objections			
Issue	Consideration of Issue		
Retrospective Works Not in Accordance with Proposed Plans.	Following site inspections by planning and subsequent discussions with the applicant's agent, amended site plans were submitted that accurately reflect the retrospective works.		
Massing, Overdevelopment, and Visual Obtrusion.	Concerns have been raised stating that the retrospective works have resulted in adverse massing, overdevelopment, visual obtrusion. It is considered that the retrospective works, including the amended garage and the single storey side extension, are in keeping with the scale		

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

Week Ending 13th February 2026

	<p>and appearance of the existing dwelling and do not materially alter the established visual context. The alterations are considered minor in scale and have not resulted in harmful massing or overdevelopment. Furthermore, any visual obstruction arising from the development is not considered so significant as to justify refusal. Accordingly, the proposed amendments are regarded as acceptable and within appropriate parameters. -storey side extension, are in keeping with the scale</p>
Visual Amenity.	<p>The use of beige facing brickwork is not considered incongruous within the locality, as the original dwelling and numerous neighbouring properties within Elmwood Park feature beige brickwork as an external finish. Thus, a clear precedent for this material therefore exists within the locality. Accordingly, the use of the proposed beige facing brickwork is deemed acceptable and would not give rise to any adverse impact on the character and appearance of the area. Further, the use of timber cladding was approved under planning application LA05/2023/0332/F, as it was considered that the proposed timber cladding would not prove harmful to the visual amenity of the locality. This premise is still maintained that the proposed timber cladding would not result in any adverse effects on the visual amenity of the locality that would warrant a refusal.</p> <p>The height of the proposed parapet and the dwelling's principal elevation is considered appropriate and acceptable, with no adverse impact on the character or appearance of the locality. The revised design remains in keeping with the scale and appearance of surrounding dwellings and does not materially alter the established visual context.</p> <p>The proposed hardstanding remains the same as that approved under planning application LA05/2023/0332/F and thus is considered acceptable.</p> <p>The proposed veranda is considered to be of an appropriate design and scale. It remains clearly subordinate to the principal dwelling by virtue of its single storey form and its position to the rear. -storey form and its position to the rear.</p> <p>The proposed air source heat pump is sited to the rear of the dwelling and is fully screened from all views within the public domain. As such, it would not result in any adverse impact on the visual amenity of the locality.</p>
Residential Amenity.	<p>The proposed air source heat pump is positioned 1m from the shared boundary with No. 8 Elmwood Park. This setback ensures to limit noise transmission to the adjoining property, thereby reducing the potential for disturbance to neighbouring occupiers. In addition, a minimum separation distance of approximately 4.5 m is maintained between the heat pump and the nearest elevation of No. 8. it is therefore considered that any potential noise related impact on neighbouring amenity would be sufficiently mitigated by the 1 m setback from the shared boundary and the overall separation distance to No. 8. -related impact on neighbouring</p>

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

Week Ending 13th February 2026

	<p>amenity would be sufficiently mitigated by the 1 m setback from the shared boundary and the overall separation distance to No. 8.</p> <p>Any potential harm arising from vehicles using the site's designated parking spaces, specifically headlights shining toward the front elevation of No. 4 Elmwood Park would be significantly mitigated by the 20-metre separation distance between the parking area and No. 4's front windows. In addition, any light generated by on-site parking would be intermittent and transitory in nature. DFI Roads have also confirmed that the location of the proposed parking spaces falls within acceptable parameters. Accordingly, the proposed parking arrangement is considered acceptable in residential amenity terms.</p> <p>The dwelling's proposed external lighting comprises several downlighters, with the exception of security lights positioned along the side pathway. These security lights operate on a one-minute timer, switching off automatically once triggered. It is considered that the proposed external lighting would not result in any notable adverse impact on neighbouring residential amenity, given the use of downlighters and the limited, time-controlled nature of the security lighting. -minute timer, switching off automatically once triggered. It is considered that the proposed external lighting would not result in any notable adverse impact on neighbouring residential amenity, given the use of downlighters and the limited, time-controlled nature of the security lighting.</p> <p>The originally proposed terrace / balcony has been amended to a veranda. The roof of the proposed veranda is not accessible and has not been designed or constructed to accommodate pedestrian use. Access to the veranda's roof is physically prevented by the installation of a glass balustrade positioned flush with the master bedroom's rear fenestration, ensuring no opportunity for entry onto the roof surface. As a result, the veranda cannot function as a raised terrace or balcony and will not give rise to any overlooking or loss of privacy for neighbouring properties. The structure is intended solely for use at ground floor level and will remain so in perpetuity, thereby ensuring no adverse impact on the residential amenity of surrounding occupiers. -floor level and will remain so in perpetuity, thereby ensuring no adverse impact on the residential amenity of surrounding occupiers.</p>
Parking.	<p>The proposed on-site parking arrangements and access remain unchanged from those approved under planning application LA05/2023/0332/F. DFI Roads were previously consulted and raised no objection to the proposed parking layout or access arrangements. Accordingly, the proposed development is considered acceptable in terms of parking provision and highway safety, and it is not anticipated to result in any adverse impact on the operation or safety of the local road network.</p>

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

Week Ending 13th February 2026

Landscape and Arboricultural Features.	As part of the proposed scheme, mature vegetation along the site's shared north-west boundary has been selectively removed and pruned where necessary. These works were undertaken as elements of the existing vegetation required arboricultural intervention. Trees capable of being retained have been kept and pruned where appropriate, while those assessed as unsalvageable have been removed and are to be replaced with new trees and hedging, as shown on the proposed landscape plan. Overall, while the works have resulted in the loss of some trees on site, the proposal would not give rise to any undue or unacceptable harm to landscape features that contribute positively to the local environmental character or quality.
Unauthorized Advertising.	It was brought to the attention of the Planning Department that temporary boarding erected around the site's curtilage was being used for advertising. The boarding had been installed solely for health and safety purposes while the site operated as an active construction area. All of the boarding has since been removed.
Change of Use / Commercial Use.	The dwelling at No. 6 Elmwood Park is used solely as a residence. There is no evidential basis to indicate that the property is, or will be, used for commercial purposes.

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

Week Ending 13th February 2026

Item Number 3			
Application Reference	LA05/2025/0533/F	Date Valid	22.07.2025
Description of Proposal	Proposed single storey rear extension to existing semi-detached dwelling	Location	1 Coopers Mill Link, Ballyoran, Dundonald
Group Recommendation	Approval	Case Officer	Jade Gillespie
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		
The proposal will have an overbearing impact on neighbouring amenity and create a sense of enclosure due to the existing boundaries of my garden. This would create an oppressive and overbearing environment which would significantly reduce the sense of openness and enjoyment of outdoor amenity.	The plans indicate that the proposed extension will be set off the boundary shared with No.3 Cooper's Mill Link by approximately 0.40 metres. The extension is proposed to measure 3.93 metres in depth, 4.71 metres in width, 2.32 metres in eaves height and 3.64 metres in maximum height. It is noted that No.3 does not benefit from any form of rear extension. It is not considered that there is an opportunity for the proposed extension to create a sense of enclosure despite the high-level rear boundary of the neighbour. The extension exceeds the advised depth limit of 3.50 metres by only 0.43 metres which is not considered to be an excessive further projection. Disregarding the further depth of the extension, the eaves and maximum height of the proposal would fall within the realms of permitted development. The restrictions of permitted development are set to ensure that proposals have an acceptable impact on character and residential amenity. The sloped roof of the extension reduces unnecessary bulk at roof level. With consideration of the above, the proposed extension is found to be appropriately scaled to ensure it does not appear overbearing to No.3.		
The proposed extension would result in daylight loss and overshadowing.	The proposed extension measures 3.93 metres, which exceeds the advised depth limit of 3.50 metres in the case of semi-detached dwellings. No.3 does not appear to benefit from any form of rear extension. The light test on the proposed plans shows that the extension will not break the 60-degree sightline from No.3's closest neighbouring		

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

Week Ending 13th February 2026

	<p>occupier. The rear elevations of the host property and No.3 are both north facing. Any loss of light or overshadowing to No.3 as a result of the proposed extension is considered to be very minimal and will be experienced in the early morning but apart from this, the garden and windows on the rear elevation of No.3 will continue to receive an adequate amount of daylight. It has therefore been found that any overshadowing or loss of daylight to No.3 as a result of the proposed extension would be very minimal.</p>
<p>The proposed extension would not appear subordinate and would dominate the rear elevation of the host property which would be contrary to good design principles which require extensions to remain proportionate and respectful to the host property.</p>	<p>The additional depth of the proposed extension is not considered excessive. In relation to the main dwellinghouse and the context of the application site, the proposed extension has been subordinately scaled and does not appear as an incongruous or cramped form of development. The proposed extension has been designed to mimic the existing character and finishes of the host property. As such, the proposal appears respectfully subordinate to the main dwelling.</p>
<p>By projecting to the boundary line between the semi-detached pair, the extension risks creating a terracing effect if a similar extension were constructed on the adjoining property. This would erode the visual separation between the dwellings and harm the character of the residential setting.</p>	<p>This proposal is for a single-storey rear extension and does not include any projection to the side of the dwelling. For this reason, the proposal would not result in a terracing effect. Nor would it erode the visual separation between the dwellings and harm the character of the residential setting.</p>
<p>The proposed stainless-steel flue will result in fumes</p>	<p>The steel flue on the proposed extension is not considered to result in visual intrusion given that No.3 will not have a direct view of it unless in their rear garden. Furthermore, the proposed flue is only marginally larger than the host property's Soil Ventilation Pipe (SVP). Following the</p>

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

Week Ending 13th February 2026

<p>odors and visual intrusion.</p>	<p>representation from No.3 being received, the Planning Department consulted with the Environmental Health Department who provided the following response:</p> <p>Environmental Health note the letter of objection published to the Planning Portal on 20 August 2025 in relation to fumes and odours. Should the objector be affected by odour/fumes from the proposed development, the Environmental Health Service Unit can be contacted by telephone on 028 9244 7300 or by email to env.health@lisburncastlereagh.gov.uk</p> <p><u>Proposed conditions:</u></p> <p>The proposed development is within a Smoke Control Area designated under the Clean Air Order (NI) 1981. Therefore, all appliances installed on this site must comply with Smoke Control Areas (Exempted Fireplaces) Regulations (NI) 1999 (as amended) and fuels used must comply with Smoke Control Areas (Authorised Fuels) Regulations (NI) 1999 (as amended).</p> <p>Reason: To ensure compliance with the smoke control regulations.'</p>
------------------------------------	--