

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

Week Ending 17th April 2026

Item Number 1			
Application Reference	LA05/2024/0136/F	Date Valid	21.02.2024
Description of Proposal	Retention of existing outbuilding and erection of new stable building comprising 2 stables and fodder store, access and associated site Works	Location	Lands adjoining and 20m south of 30 Lisleen Road, Belfast
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
3	N/A	N/A	N/A
Consideration of Objections			
Issue	Consideration of Issue		
Conflict with existing road junction.	The proposal seeks to upgrade an existing access onto Lisleen Road. DFI Roads were consulted on matters including junction spacing, conflicting vehicular movements and overall road safety. They have assessed the relationship between the proposed access and the neighbouring access at No. 30 and raise no objection. No concerns were identified regarding junction spacing or conflict with existing movements.		
Unacceptable visibility splays.	Drawing No. 02D demonstrates visibility splays of 2.4 x 87m (left) and 2.4 x 79m (right). DFI Roads have reviewed these details and confirmed that the visibility splays are acceptable for this type of access in this location. They raise no objection to the proposed splays and have not required third-party land or additional works to achieve visibility.		
Increased traffic generation.	DFI Roads have been consulted on the application and have considered the potential intensification of the access. They raise no objection and have not identified any requirement for road widening, upgrading or other mitigation works on Lisleen Road.		
Detrimental impact on pedestrian safety.	The proposal involves upgrading an existing access. DFI Roads have considered pedestrian safety and did not require the provision of a footway in this rural location. They raise no objection on pedestrian safety grounds.		

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

Week Ending 17th April 2026

Inadequate turning facilities.	DFI Roads have reviewed the proposed turning arrangements within the site and raise no concerns. They are satisfied that vehicles can enter and exit the site in a forward gear.
Carriageway width (5.5m not provided).	DFI Roads have assessed the proposal and have not required any frontage widening or carriageway improvements. They raise no concerns regarding the width of Lisleen Road at this location.
Road gradients unsafe / non-compliant.	DFI Roads have reviewed the gradient of the existing and proposed access. They have imposed a specific condition requiring the access gradient to comply with their standards. This condition would be imposed on any decision notice and ensures that the access is constructed to an acceptable standard in the interests of road safety. DFI Roads raise no objection subject to this requirement.
Inadequate parking numbers.	Drawing No. 02D indicates two parking spaces to the side of the proposed stables. DFI Roads have reviewed the parking provision and raise no objection.
No pedestrian access provided.	DFI Roads have not required a pedestrian footway or separate pedestrian access as part of this proposal. They raise no objection on this matter.
No sewerage facilities provided.	The application form confirms that no new foul sewerage provision is proposed. No W/C or toilet facilities are shown on the plans, and none were observed during the site visit. LCCC Environmental Health and NIEA Water Management Unit have been consulted and raise no concerns regarding sewage.

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

Week Ending 17th April 2026

Item Number 2			
Application Reference	LA05/2025/0630/F	Date Valid	02.09.2025
Description of Proposal	Change of use from domestic garage to residential unit (Retrospective)	Location	50 Knockbracken Drive, Belfast
Group Recommendation	Refusal	Case Officer	Kevin Maguire
Reasons for Recommendation			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposal is contrary to Policy COU1 of the Lisburn and Castlereagh City Council's 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 Policy COU4 of the Lisburn and Castlereagh City Council's Plan Strategy, in that the building on site to be converted is not considered to be a non-listed vernacular building or a suitable locally important building. The proposal is contrary to Policy RE2 of the Lisburn and Castlereagh City Council's Plan Strategy and Paragraph 6.232 of the Strategic Planning Policy Statement, in that it has not been demonstrated that the proposed development has considered the appropriate use of micro-generation energy. 			
Representations			
Objection Letters	Support Letters	Objection Petitions	Support Petitions
2	N/A	N/A	N/A
Consideration of Objections			
Issue	Consideration of Issue		
The site does not meet planning policy.	It has been noted through the assessment that the proposed dwelling does not, in the opinion of the Council, meet any of the exceptions outlined under countryside planning policy.		
Noise and anti-social behaviour.	This appears to have related to a previous use when the site was rented out as temporary accommodation along with a larger unauthorised building which has since been removed. As this proposal relates only to a dwelling house it is not considered that noise and anti-social behaviour will be a significant issue with this development. No issues have been raised in this regard with comments received from Environmental Health.		

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

Week Ending 17th April 2026

<p>Traffic congestion/blocking road.</p>	<p>The development proposes a small dwelling and for residential purposes is unlikely to generate a significant volume of additional traffic. Regarding the potential of blocking the existing laneway Dfl Roads have raised no issues. Further clarification on this was sought on the back of this objection and it was advised that the carriageway outside of the property is not an adopted road and therefore Dfl Roads have advised they would have no concern/jurisdiction.</p>
<p>Road safety.</p>	<p>The objection has cited the lack of visibility existing the site onto Knockbracken Drive. It is noted that this is a very minor road with minimal traffic as does not provide any through road to the east. In addition, Dfl Roads has advised that this section is not an adopted road and therefore any upgrade to the visibility splays has not been requested, with no objection being raised to the proposal as a whole. In this case the consultation response and current circumstances on the ground would not support a refusal on the grounds of Policy TRA2.</p>
<p>Damage to public road.</p>	<p>The scale of the development within this application is unlikely to have a significant impact on the condition of the laneway. It is however noted that the laneway adjacent to the site is not an adopted road and therefore any damage caused to this would be a civil matter.</p>
<p>The current use is contrary to PAC decision.</p>	<p>This issue is noted. The assessment of this application has taken the previous applications and appeal decisions into consideration, and it has been determined that the application for a dwelling at this location would not be considered as a type of development which in principle would be considered to be acceptable in the countryside.</p>
<p>Land ownership issues.</p>	<p>It has been claimed in an objection that the dwelling under consideration has been constructed on land not under control of the applicant. This issue has been raised with the applicant, and it has been advised that they own the land within the boundary of the current planning application, therefore Certificate A within the application form would remain relevant in this case. Any further issues relating to land ownership disputes would be a civil matter between the relevant parties.</p>
<p>The building is unsuitable for the current use.</p>	<p>The objection has cited that the building is unsuitable for its current use however has not provided any clarification on this point. While it has been noted that the use of the building for a dwelling is considered contrary to planning policy, the suitability of this building for the dwelling through its construction lies outside the scope of this planning application and would instead be subject to building control regulations which would fall outside the planning process.</p>

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

Week Ending 17th April 2026

Item Number 3			
Application Reference	LA05/2026/0074/F	Date Valid	28.01.2026
Description of Proposal	Extension of existing retail unit (Unit 1) with public realm improvements including new seating and landscaping, and all associated site works including reconfiguration of car parking.	Location	Lands to the west of Starbucks and southwest of Pop Eyes within the existing car park, Lesley Forestside Shopping Centre, Upper Galwally, Belfast
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		
Parking and traffic.	<p>Concern is expressed about loss of car parking spaces and increased traffic congestion. The view is expressed that tail backs around the site have been bad enough and increasing especially over on the dual carriageway with the main reason for this seems to be already limited parking and reduced space for cars to easily navigate in and out of the site.</p> <p>The proposed development is a small extension of 50 square metres to an already approved unit which is approved as a complementary use for those already visiting Forestside Shopping Centre. For Unit 1 there would be an element of new and majority shared trips to the site. The proposal would involve the loss of 4 car parking spaces and the re-configuration of disabled spaces; the number of disabled spaces would not be changed by the proposal. The planning history details a car parking analysis for the overall site.</p> <p>Based on the information presented as part of the planning approval LA05/2024/0274/F there is still sufficient capacity within Forestside Shopping Centre to accommodate this additional loss of 4no. car parking spaces. Dfl Roads have been consulted on the application and have no objections and provided a standard condition and informatives to be</p>		

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

Week Ending 17th April 2026

	<p>placed on the decision notice. It is considered that the proposal would not prejudice road safety or significantly inconvenience the flow of traffic, that there is adequate provision for parking and complies with Policies TRA1, TRA2 and TRA7.</p>
--	---

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

Week Ending 17th April 2026

Item Number 4			
Application Reference	LA05/2025/0567/F	Date Valid	11.08.2025
Description of Proposal	Change of use from office premises to self-catering accommodation	Location	1 and 3 Ava Street, Lisburn
Group Recommendation	Approval	Case Officer	Joseph Billham
Reasons for Recommendation			
All relevant planning material considerations have been satisfied.			
Representations			
Objection Letters	Support Letters	Objection Petitions	Support Petitions
3	N/A	N/A	N/A
Consideration of Objections			
Issue	Consideration of Issue		
Access for emergency vehicles and road safety.	DFI Roads have been consulted on access and road safety and offered no objections to the proposal.		
Traffic generation and parking.	DFI Roads have been consulted on traffic and parking and offered no objections.		
Noise and privacy issues.	Environmental Health have been consulted in relation to noise and raised no concerns.		
Inconvenience during construction.	Impact during construction is outside the remit of planning control.		
Overlooking and impact on privacy.	The proposal does not include any extension to the existing building. The proposal is utilising the existing openings on the ground and first floor. There is a minor fenestration on the ground floor through inserting a single door. The proposal is considered not to exacerbate existing conditions on site by way of overlooking and shall have no undue impact here.		
How parking information has been ascertained.	The application is assessed based on the information made available to it. The agent clarified the numbers visiting the site and the information submitted is considered accurate.		
Overdevelopment of site and out of character.	The proposal is not considered to be an overdevelopment of the site and is converting the existing building from office space to self-catering accommodation. The surrounding area is a mix of commercial and residential uses. The proposal is seen to be appropriate to the area that respects the scale, size and design.		