

Week Ending 19th September 2025

Item Number 1			
Application Reference	LA05/2023/0170/F	Date Valid	22.02.2023
Description of	Proposed infill dwelling	Location	92 Glenavy Road, Lisburn
Proposal	and garage		
Group	Refusal	Case	Catherine Gray
Recommendation		Officer	-

Reasons for Recommendation

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.

The proposal is contrary to Policy COU8 of the Lisburn and Castlereagh City Council Plan Strategy, in that the development, if approved, would add to a ribbon of development along Glenavy Road. Furthermore, the proposal does not meet the exceptions test in that the gap is not sufficient to accommodate two dwellings within an otherwise substantial and continuously built-up frontage and the buildings forming the substantial and continuously built-up frontage are not visually linked.

Representations			
Objection Letters	Support Letters	Objection Petitions	Support Petitions
0	N/A	N/A	N/A
Consideration of C)bjections		
Issue	Consideration of Issue		



Item Number 2				
Application Reference	LA05/2023/0825/O	Date Valid	17.10.2	2023
Description of Proposal	2 No infill dwellings with garages	Location		between 28 & 30a el Road, Moneyreagh
Group Recommendation	Approval	Case Officer		ine Gray
Reasons for Recor	nmendation			
All relevant planning	material considerations h	ave been sati	sfied.	
Representations				
Objection Letters 1	Support Letters N/A	Objection Pe N/A	titions	Support Petitions N/A
Consideration of O	bjections	<u> </u>		
Issue	Consideration of Issue			
Access.	and minimise safety cond It is acknowledged that the Ballykeel Road and the access from the Ashdene proposal and raised no oproposal would not prejuvehicles and complies with development is approved temporary nature and wo completed. These are conditions	states that other risk to Ashdorms and disrems and disrems and disrems and application he Ashdene Resonant Properties of the policy TRA displayed to be present on sidered to be the issue is g	ner acceene Roa uption. site can Road. The coads has concerns. ety or ince 2 Access works a the until the e norma iven little	be accessed from both is application proposes we been consulted on the It is considered that the onvenience the flow of to Public Roads. If the and traffic are of a e development is I impacts in relation to the e weight in the assessment
	developers and their con	tractors to be uration of the	consider	rate neighbours and to not This would be a civil/legal



Week Ending 19th September 2025

Item Number 3			
Application Reference	LA05/2024/0025/O	Date Valid	05.01.2024
Description of Proposal	Proposed storey and a half farm dwelling with detached garage using existing farm laneway with site selected to visually cluster with farm cluster.	Location	Farm dwelling 85m southeast of 1 Hillsborough Road, Moira
Group Recommendation	Refusal	Case Officer	Kevin Maguire

Reasons for Recommendation

- The proposal is contrary to Policy COU1 of the Lisburn and Castlereagh City Council Plan Strategy in that the proposed development is not a type of development which in principle is acceptable in the countryside.
- The proposal is contrary to Criteria (b) of Policy COU10 of the Lisburn and Castlereagh
 City Council Plan Strategy in that it has not been demonstrated that a development
 opportunity out with settlement limits have been sold off from the farm holding within 10
 years of the date of the application.
 - The proposal is contrary to Criteria (c) of Policy COU10 of the Lisburn and Castlereagh City Council Plan Strategy in that the new buildings are not sited to cluster with an established group of buildings on the farm, nor has it been demonstrated that the proposed alternative site is justified.

Representations

Objection Letters	Support Letters	Objection Petitions	Support Petitions
2	N/A	N/A	N/A

Consideration of Objections

Issue	Consideration of Issue
Potential impact on adjacent listed building.	The application has been consulted with Historic Environment Division who has considered the proposal and has raised no objections subject to the inclusion of conditions should the proposal be approved.
Ownership issues.	The issue raised relates to the ownership of the agricultural laneway within the application site. This issue was queried with the applicant, and an amended location plan was submitted to address the issues raised. The access details were also amended demonstrating forward site distance without impacting on third party land. Further neighbour notification and advertisement was undertaken following this and no additional representations on this point have been raised.



Application Reference Description of Proposal Approval Ap						
Description of Proposal Dwelling and garage Location Moira Moira	Item Number 4					
Proposal Group Recommendation		LA05/2022/0525/F	Date Valid	26.05.2	2022	
Recommendation All relevant planning material considerations have been satisfied. Representations Objection Letters 17 N/A N/A N/A N/A Consideration of Objections Issue Consideration of Objections Issue Consideration of Issue Overdevelopment and scale and density exceeded. Parking and turning space is limited and Impact on neighbour's access. Overlooking and reduction in privacy and amenity. It is considered the proposal given the position and separation distance shall not have any adverse impact by way of overlooking. Given the orientation of the windows no direct overlooking on adjacent properties will arise. The proposal is considered to provide reasonable space between the proposed dwelling and surrounding properties to minimise overshadowing. Loss of light and overshadowing the proposal is considered to provide reasonable space between the proposed dwelling and surrounding properties to minimise overshadowing however not to an unacceptable level. The dwellings at No 1 and 3 are situated at a higher ground level and may be impacted on loss of light in the morning but not to an unacceptable level. It should be noted that overshadowing to a garden area on its own will rarely constitute refusal of planning permission. Loss in property value. Loss in property with light the right to a private view is a material consideration, it is not given	I	Dwelling and garage	Location	Moira		
Representations Objection Letters		Approval		Joseph	n Billham	
Support Letters Support Letters Objection Petitions Support Petitions	Reasons for Recor	nmendation		<u>'</u>		
Objection Letters 17 N/A	All relevant planning	material considerations h	nave been sati	sfied.		
Consideration of Objections	Representations					
Consideration of Objections	Objection Letters	Support Letters	Objection Pe	titions	Support Petitions	
Overdevelopment and scale and density exceeded. Parking and turning space is limited and Impact on neighbour's access. Overlooking and reduction in privacy and amenity. Loss of light and overshadowing. Loss of light and overshadowing. Loss in property value is not out of an separation distance on loss of light in the morning but not to an unacceptable level. It should be noted that overshadowing to a private view is a material consideration, it is not given the residential development. Taking into account the built-up nature of the residential development that is considered the plot size and separation distance is not out of keeping with the surrounding area. DFI Roads have been consulted on parking, access and manoeuvring of vehicles and offered no objections to the proposal. It is considered the proposal given the position and separation distance shall not have any adverse impact by way of overlooking. Given the orientation of the windows no direct overlooking on adjacent properties will arise. The proposal is considered to provide reasonable space between the proposed dwelling and surrounding properties to minimise overlooking. The dwelling is sited further north (10m from the turning head) and set further off the boundary with No 5 and 7. It is considered the proposal may impact on the afternoon for both No 5 and 7 by way of overshadowing however not to an unacceptable level. The dwellings at No 1 and 3 are situated at a higher ground level and may be impacted on loss of light in the morning but not to an unacceptable level. It should be noted that overshadowing to a garden area on its own will rarely constitute refusal of planning permission. Loss in property value is not a planning material consideration, it is not given				, titionio		
Overdevelopment and scale and density exceeded. Parking and turning space is limited and Impact on neighbour's access. Overlooking and reduction in privacy and amenity. Loss of light and overshadowing. The proposal is considered to respect the pattern of development. Taking into account the built-up nature of the residential development that is characterised by mixed density development it is considered the plot size and separation distance is not out of keeping with the surrounding area. DFI Roads have been consulted on parking, access and manoeuvring of vehicles and offered no objections to the proposal. It is considered the proposal given the position and separation distance shall not have any adverse impact by way of overlooking. Given the orientation of the windows no direct overlooking on adjacent properties will arise. The proposal is considered to provide reasonable space between the proposed dwelling and surrounding properties to minimise overlooking. The dwelling is sited further north (10m from the turning head) and set further off the boundary with No 5 and 7. It is considered the proposal may impact on the afternoon for both No 5 and 7 by way of overshadowing however not to an unacceptable level. The dwellings at No 1 and 3 are situated at a higher ground level and may be impacted on loss of light in the morning but not to an unacceptable level. It should be noted that overshadowing to a garden area on its own will rarely constitute refusal of planning permission. Loss in property value is not a planning material consideration that can be given determining weight. Whilst the right to a private view is a material consideration, it is not given	Consideration of C	bjections				
Overdevelopment and scale and density exceeded. Parking and turning space is limited and Impact on neighbour's access. Overlooking and reduction in privacy and amenity. Loss of light and overshadowing. The proposal is considered to respect the pattern of development. Taking into account the built-up nature of the residential development that is characterised by mixed density development it is considered the plot size and separation distance is not out of keeping with the surrounding area. DFI Roads have been consulted on parking, access and manoeuvring of vehicles and offered no objections to the proposal. It is considered the proposal given the position and separation distance shall not have any adverse impact by way of overlooking. Given the orientation of the windows no direct overlooking on adjacent properties will arise. The proposal is considered to provide reasonable space between the proposed dwelling and surrounding properties to minimise overlooking. The dwelling is sited further north (10m from the turning head) and set further off the boundary with No 5 and 7. It is considered the proposal may impact on the afternoon for both No 5 and 7 by way of overshadowing however not to an unacceptable level. The dwellings at No 1 and 3 are situated at a higher ground level and may be impacted on loss of light in the morning but not to an unacceptable level. It should be noted that overshadowing to a garden area on its own will rarely constitute refusal of planning permission. Loss in property value is not a planning material consideration that can be given determining weight. Whilst the right to a private view is a material consideration, it is not given	-					
and scale and density exceeded. Parking and turning space is limited and Impact on neighbour's access. Overlooking and reduction in privacy and amenity. Loss of light and overshadowing. Loss of light and overshadowing are into a private yalue. Loss in property Value. Whilst the right to a private view is a material consideration, it is not given the rost of the plot size and separation distance shall not have any adverse impact by way of overlooking. Given the orientation of the windows no direct overlooking on adjacent properties will arise. The proposal is considered to provide reasonable space between the proposed dwelling and surrounding properties to minimise overlooking. The dwelling is sited further north (10m from the turning head) and set further off the boundary with No 5 and 7. It is considered the proposal may impact on the afternoon for both No 5 and 7 by way of overshadowing however not to an unacceptable level. The dwellings at No 1 and 3 are situated at a higher ground level and may be impacted on loss of light in the morning but not to an unacceptable level. It should be noted that overshadowing to a garden area on its own will rarely constitute refusal of planning permission. Loss in property value is not a planning material consideration that can be given determining weight. Whilst the right to a private view is a material consideration, it is not given						
density exceeded. Characterised by mixed density development it is considered the plot size and separation distance is not out of keeping with the surrounding area. DFI Roads have been consulted on parking, access and manoeuvring of vehicles and offered no objections to the proposal. DFI Roads have been consulted on parking, access and manoeuvring of vehicles and offered no objections to the proposal. It is considered the proposal given the position and separation distance shall not have any adverse impact by way of overlooking. Given the orientation of the windows no direct overlooking on adjacent properties will arise. The proposal is considered to provide reasonable space between the proposed dwelling and surrounding properties to minimise overlooking. Loss of light and overshadowing. The dwelling is sited further north (10m from the turning head) and set further off the boundary with No 5 and 7. It is considered the proposal may impact on the afternoon for both No 5 and 7 by way of overshadowing however not to an unacceptable level. The dwellings at No 1 and 3 are situated at a higher ground level and may be impacted on loss of light in the morning but not to an unacceptable level. It should be noted that overshadowing to a garden area on its own will rarely constitute refusal of planning permission. Loss in property value is not a planning material consideration that can be given determining weight. Whilst the right to a private view is a material consideration, it is not given						
Parking and turning space is limited and Impact on neighbour's access. Overlooking and reduction in privacy and amenity. Loss of light and overshadowing. The dwelling is sited further north (10m from the turning head) and set further off the boundary with No 5 and 7. It is considered the proposal may impact on the afternoon for both No 5 and 7 by way of overshadowing house of light in the morning but not to an unacceptable level. It should be noted that overshadowing to a garden area on its own will rarely constitute refusal of planning permission. Loss in property value. Impact on view. DFI Roads have been consulted on parking, access and manoeuvring of vehicles and offered no objections to the proposal. DFI Roads have been consulted on parking, access and manoeuvring of vehicles and offered no objections to the proposal. DFI Roads have been consulted on parking, access and manoeuvring of vehicles and offered no objections to the proposal. DFI Roads have been consulted on parking, access and manoeuvring of vehicles and manoeuvring of vehicles and offered no objections to the proposal. It is considered the proposal given the position and separation distance shall not have any adverse impact by way of overlooking. Given the orientation of the windows no direct overlooking on adjacent properties will arise. The proposal is considered to provide reasonable space between the proposal dwelling and surrounding properties to minimise overlooking. The dwelling is sited further north (10m from the turning head) and set further off the boundary with No 5 and 7. It is considered the proposal may impact on the afternoon for both No 5 and 7 by way of overshadowing to an adjacent properties will arise. The dwellings at No 1 and 3 are situated at a higher ground level and may be impacted on loss of light in the morning but not to an unacceptable level. It should be noted that overshadowing to a garden area on its own will rarely constitute refusal of planning permission. Loss in property value is not a planning ma	and scale and					
Parking and turning space is limited and Impact on neighbour's access. Overlooking and reduction in privacy and amenity. It is considered the proposal given the position and separation distance shall not have any adverse impact by way of overlooking. Given the orientation of the windows no direct overlooking on adjacent properties will arise. The proposal is considered to provide reasonable space between the proposed dwelling and surrounding properties to minimise overlooking. Loss of light and overshadowing. The dwelling is sited further north (10m from the turning head) and set further off the boundary with No 5 and 7. It is considered the proposal may impact on the afternoon for both No 5 and 7 by way of overshadowing however not to an unacceptable level. The dwellings at No 1 and 3 are situated at a higher ground level and may be impacted on loss of light in the morning but not to an unacceptable level. It should be noted that overshadowing to a garden area on its own will rarely constitute refusal of planning permission. Loss in property value is not a planning material consideration, it is not given whilest the right to a private view is a material consideration, it is not given	density exceeded.	characterised by mixed of	density develo	pment it	is considered the plot size	
turning space is limited and Impact on neighbour's access. Overlooking and reduction in privacy and amenity. Loss of light and overshadowing. Loss of light and overshadowing are it in the morning but not to an unacceptable level. The dwellings at No 1 and 3 are situated at a higher ground level and may be impacted on loss of light in the morning but not to an unacceptable level. It should be noted that overshadowing to a garden area on its own will rarely constitute refusal of planning permission. Loss in property value is not a planning material consideration that can be given determining weight. Whilst the right to a private view is a material consideration, it is not given		and separation distance	is not out of k	eeping w	ith the surrounding area.	
limited and Impact on neighbour's access. Overlooking and reduction in privacy and amenity. Loss of light and overshadowing. The dwelling is sited further north (10m from the turning head) and set further off the boundary with No 5 and 7. It is considered the proposal may impact on the afternoon for both No 5 and 7 by way of overshadowing however not to an unacceptable level. It should be noted that overshadowing to a garden area on its own will rarely constitute refusal of planning permission. Loss in property value. Impact on view. It is considered the proposal given the position and separation distance shall not have any adverse impact by way of overlooking. Given the orientation of the windows no direct overlooking on adjacent properties will arise. The proposal is considered to provide reasonable space between the proposal dwelling and surrounding properties to minimise overlooking. The dwelling is sited further north (10m from the turning head) and set further off the boundary with No 5 and 7. It is considered the proposal may impact on the afternoon for both No 5 and 7 by way of overshadowing however not to an unacceptable level. The dwellings at No 1 and 3 are situated at a higher ground level and may be impacted on loss of light in the morning but not to an unacceptable level. It should be noted that overshadowing to a garden area on its own will rarely constitute refusal of planning permission. Loss in property value is not a planning material consideration that can be given determining weight. Whilst the right to a private view is a material consideration, it is not given	Parking and	DFI Roads have been co	onsulted on pa	irking, ac	ccess and manoeuvring of	
on neighbour's access. Overlooking and reduction in privacy and amenity. Loss of light and overshadowing. The dwelling is sited further north (10m from the turning head) and set further off the boundary with No 5 and 7. It is considered the proposal may impact on the afternoon for both No 5 and 7 by way of overshadowing at No 1 and 3 are situated at a higher ground level and may be impacted on loss of light in the morning but not to an unacceptable level. It should be noted that overshadowing to a garden area on its own will rarely constitute refusal of planning permission. Loss in property value. Impact on view. Whilst the right to a private view is a material consideration, it is not given	turning space is	vehicles and offered no	objections to tl	he propo	sal.	
on neighbour's access. Overlooking and reduction in privacy and amenity. Loss of light and overshadowing. The dwelling is sited further north (10m from the turning head) and set further off the boundary with No 5 and 7. It is considered the proposal may impact on the afternoon for both No 5 and 7 by way of overshadowing at No 1 and 3 are situated at a higher ground level and may be impacted on loss of light in the morning but not to an unacceptable level. It should be noted that overshadowing to a garden area on its own will rarely constitute refusal of planning permission. Loss in property value. Impact on view. Whilst the right to a private view is a material consideration, it is not given	limited and Impact		•			
Overlooking and reduction in privacy and amenity. Loss of light and overshadowing. The dwelling is sited further north (10m from the turning head) and set further off the boundary with No 5 and 7. It is considered the proposal may impact on the afternoon for both No 5 and 7 by way of overshadowing however not to an unacceptable level. The dwellings at No 1 and 3 are situated at a higher ground level and may be impacted on loss of light in the morning but not to an unacceptable level. It should be noted that overshadowing to a garden area on its own will rarely constitute refusal of planning permission. Loss in property value. Impact on view. Whilst the right to a private view is a material consideration, it is not given						
shall not have any adverse impact by way of overlooking. Given the orientation of the windows no direct overlooking on adjacent properties will arise. The proposal is considered to provide reasonable space between the proposed dwelling and surrounding properties to minimise overlooking. Loss of light and overshadowing. The dwelling is sited further north (10m from the turning head) and set further off the boundary with No 5 and 7. It is considered the proposal may impact on the afternoon for both No 5 and 7 by way of overshadowing however not to an unacceptable level. The dwellings at No 1 and 3 are situated at a higher ground level and may be impacted on loss of light in the morning but not to an unacceptable level. It should be noted that overshadowing to a garden area on its own will rarely constitute refusal of planning permission. Loss in property value is not a planning material consideration that can be given determining weight. Whilst the right to a private view is a material consideration, it is not given	_					
shall not have any adverse impact by way of overlooking. Given the orientation of the windows no direct overlooking on adjacent properties will arise. The proposal is considered to provide reasonable space between the proposed dwelling and surrounding properties to minimise overlooking. Loss of light and overshadowing. The dwelling is sited further north (10m from the turning head) and set further off the boundary with No 5 and 7. It is considered the proposal may impact on the afternoon for both No 5 and 7 by way of overshadowing however not to an unacceptable level. The dwellings at No 1 and 3 are situated at a higher ground level and may be impacted on loss of light in the morning but not to an unacceptable level. It should be noted that overshadowing to a garden area on its own will rarely constitute refusal of planning permission. Loss in property value is not a planning material consideration that can be given determining weight. Whilst the right to a private view is a material consideration, it is not given	Overlooking and	It is considered the prope	osal given the	position	and separation distance	
orientation of the windows no direct overlooking on adjacent properties will arise. The proposal is considered to provide reasonable space between the proposed dwelling and surrounding properties to minimise overlooking. Loss of light and overshadowing. The dwelling is sited further north (10m from the turning head) and set further off the boundary with No 5 and 7. It is considered the proposal may impact on the afternoon for both No 5 and 7 by way of overshadowing however not to an unacceptable level. The dwellings at No 1 and 3 are situated at a higher ground level and may be impacted on loss of light in the morning but not to an unacceptable level. It should be noted that overshadowing to a garden area on its own will rarely constitute refusal of planning permission. Loss in property value is not a planning material consideration that can be given determining weight. Whilst the right to a private view is a material consideration, it is not given						
amenity. will arise. The proposal is considered to provide reasonable space between the proposed dwelling and surrounding properties to minimise overlooking. Loss of light and overshadowing. The dwelling is sited further north (10m from the turning head) and set further off the boundary with No 5 and 7. It is considered the proposal may impact on the afternoon for both No 5 and 7 by way of overshadowing however not to an unacceptable level. The dwellings at No 1 and 3 are situated at a higher ground level and may be impacted on loss of light in the morning but not to an unacceptable level. It should be noted that overshadowing to a garden area on its own will rarely constitute refusal of planning permission. Loss in property value is not a planning material consideration that can be given determining weight. Whilst the right to a private view is a material consideration, it is not given	privacy and					
between the proposed dwelling and surrounding properties to minimise overlooking. Loss of light and overshadowing. The dwelling is sited further north (10m from the turning head) and set further off the boundary with No 5 and 7. It is considered the proposal may impact on the afternoon for both No 5 and 7 by way of overshadowing however not to an unacceptable level. The dwellings at No 1 and 3 are situated at a higher ground level and may be impacted on loss of light in the morning but not to an unacceptable level. It should be noted that overshadowing to a garden area on its own will rarely constitute refusal of planning permission. Loss in property value is not a planning material consideration that can be given determining weight. Whilst the right to a private view is a material consideration, it is not given						
Loss of light and overshadowing. The dwelling is sited further north (10m from the turning head) and set further off the boundary with No 5 and 7. It is considered the proposal may impact on the afternoon for both No 5 and 7 by way of overshadowing however not to an unacceptable level. The dwellings at No 1 and 3 are situated at a higher ground level and may be impacted on loss of light in the morning but not to an unacceptable level. It should be noted that overshadowing to a garden area on its own will rarely constitute refusal of planning permission. Loss in property value is not a planning material consideration that can be given determining weight. Whilst the right to a private view is a material consideration, it is not given				•	•	
overshadowing. further off the boundary with No 5 and 7. It is considered the proposal may impact on the afternoon for both No 5 and 7 by way of overshadowing however not to an unacceptable level. The dwellings at No 1 and 3 are situated at a higher ground level and may be impacted on loss of light in the morning but not to an unacceptable level. It should be noted that overshadowing to a garden area on its own will rarely constitute refusal of planning permission. Loss in property value is not a planning material consideration that can be given determining weight. Whilst the right to a private view is a material consideration, it is not given			Ü			
may impact on the afternoon for both No 5 and 7 by way of overshadowing however not to an unacceptable level. The dwellings at No 1 and 3 are situated at a higher ground level and may be impacted on loss of light in the morning but not to an unacceptable level. It should be noted that overshadowing to a garden area on its own will rarely constitute refusal of planning permission. Loss in property value is not a planning material consideration that can be given determining weight. Whilst the right to a private view is a material consideration, it is not given	Loss of light and	The dwelling is sited furt	her north (10n	n from th	e turning head) and set	
overshadowing however not to an unacceptable level. The dwellings at No 1 and 3 are situated at a higher ground level and may be impacted on loss of light in the morning but not to an unacceptable level. It should be noted that overshadowing to a garden area on its own will rarely constitute refusal of planning permission. Loss in property value is not a planning material consideration that can be given determining weight. Whilst the right to a private view is a material consideration, it is not given	overshadowing.	further off the boundary	with No 5 and	7. It is co	onsidered the proposal	
No 1 and 3 are situated at a higher ground level and may be impacted on loss of light in the morning but not to an unacceptable level. It should be noted that overshadowing to a garden area on its own will rarely constitute refusal of planning permission. Loss in property value is not a planning material consideration that can be given determining weight. Whilst the right to a private view is a material consideration, it is not given		may impact on the afterr	noon for both N	No 5 and	7 by way of	
No 1 and 3 are situated at a higher ground level and may be impacted on loss of light in the morning but not to an unacceptable level. It should be noted that overshadowing to a garden area on its own will rarely constitute refusal of planning permission. Loss in property value is not a planning material consideration that can be given determining weight. Whilst the right to a private view is a material consideration, it is not given						
loss of light in the morning but not to an unacceptable level. It should be noted that overshadowing to a garden area on its own will rarely constitute refusal of planning permission. Loss in property value is not a planning material consideration that can be given determining weight. Impact on view. Whilst the right to a private view is a material consideration, it is not given						
noted that overshadowing to a garden area on its own will rarely constitute refusal of planning permission. Loss in property value is not a planning material consideration that can be given determining weight. Impact on view. Whilst the right to a private view is a material consideration, it is not given						
constitute refusal of planning permission. Loss in property value is not a planning material consideration that can be given determining weight. Impact on view. Whilst the right to a private view is a material consideration, it is not given						
Loss in property value is not a planning material consideration that can be given determining weight. Impact on view. Uoss in property value is not a planning material consideration that can be given determining weight. Whilst the right to a private view is a material consideration, it is not given					,	
value.given determining weight.Impact on view.Whilst the right to a private view is a material consideration, it is not given	Loss in property				al consideration that can be	
Impact on view. Whilst the right to a private view is a material consideration, it is not given				-		
	Impact on view.			aterial c	onsideration, it is not given	
actorisming trought as the official follower in the treat to subjective and						



	cannot be quantified as a significant and adverse impact. The dwelling is set back 10m form the turning head and not completely in front of No 1.
Proximity to surrounding properties.	The proximity of the proposal dwelling is not out of keeping with the surrounding character of the area within the urban context and have appropriate space between buildings.
Contrary to criteria	Following the adoption of the Plan Strategy Policy QD1 has been
A and H of policy QD1 of Planning Policy Statement 7 in that the proposed development would, if permitted, fail to respect the surrounding area in terms of layout and would have an unacceptable adverse effect on existing properties in terms of	replaced by Policy HOU3. The layout is considered appropriate to the character and respects the surrounding context. The proposal shall not result in an unacceptable impact by way of overshadowing and loss of light due to the separation distance to neighbouring properties. The proposal is considered to comply with Policy HOU3.
overshadowing. Contrary to Criteria B of Policy LC1 of the PPS7 in that the pattern of the development is not in keeping with the overall character of the area.	Following the adoption of the Plan Strategy Policy LC1 has been replaced by Policy HOU8. The proposal is considered to respect the surrounding area and pattern of development and not have a detrimental impact on residential amenity. The proposal is considered to comply with Policy HOU8.
Design, bulk and orientation of the dwelling is out of character and has a negative visual impact.	The scale, size and design of the house are considered appropriate and shall not have a negative visual impact given the mix house types in the area. The orientation is considered acceptable and shall not have an adverse impact on the character of the area.
Amount of obscure glazing and velux windows.	The size and style of the windows match the surrounding area. The two rooflight windows are not excessive on the rear elevation. The use of obscure glazing is required to mitigate any concerns of overlooking.
Site levels not shown for dwelling, garage and parking area.	Ground levels and cross sections of the proposed dwelling and garage have been provided on the submitted plans.
Overlooking from existing boundary wall.	The proposed boundary treatments include tree planting and a 1.8m fencing has been that mitigate any overlooking from ground level.



Concern raised	The structural integrity is outside the control of planning remit and the
over structural	onus is on the developer to make sure the ground is safe.
issues of boundary	
wall and no	
retaining wall	
indicated.	
Impact on surface	EHO, NIW and WMU have been consulted and offered no objections in
water and	regard to drainage and surface water.
drainage.	
Ownership	The appellant has completed certificate A) to certify they are in full
concerns.	possession of the land. Land ownership is a civil matter.
Impact on noise	EHO have been considered on the impact on noise and offered no
levels during	objections.
construction.	
Proximity of the	Maintenance purposes is a civil matter. The separation distance is
garage to wall and	considered acceptable.
being unable to	
access it for	
maintenance	
purposes.	
Inaccuracies in	The plans are deemed to be fully accurate.
drawing submitted.	
Right of way not	Right of way has been shown in green in the Site Location Plan.
indicated on plans.	
Land intended as	The land is zoned for housing under the LAP and Draft BMAP within the
green space.	settlement limit of Moira.
Impact of	Maintenance of landscaping between dwelling is a civil matter and not
overgrown trees	within the remit of planning.
near boundary and	
spillover into	
neighbouring	
garden.	



	Week Ending 19th	behteilinei	2025			
Item Number 5						
Application Reference	LA05/2024/0867/F	Date Valid	02.12.	2024		
Description of Proposal	Replacement dwelling	Location	Hillsborough			
Group Recommendation	Approval Case Joseph Billham Officer					
Reasons for Recor	Reasons for Recommendation					
All relevant planning	g material considerations hav	/e been satisfi	ed.			
Representations						
Objection Letters	Support Letters	Objection Pet	titions	Support Petitions		
3	N/A	N/Á		N/A		
Consideration of O	bjections					
Issue	Consideration of Issue					
Loss of private and amenity bedroom windows on rear annex. Removal of boundary planting in advance of planning application has contributed to loss of privacy.	Taking into consideration the separation distance of 14m to the shared boundary and 30m from the first-floor window to No 21 Kilwarlin Road building to building there shall be no undue overlooking. In addition taking into account the additional landscaping and trees to be planting along the boundaries shall mitigate any overlooking concerns. The Council can only assess an application based on the boundary treatments in situ. The planting schedule including embellished hedging and new tree planting is considered appropriate to minimise any unduly loss of privacy.					
Inaccuracies in drawing with regards to Landscaping proposals.	Amended plans were received in relation to additional landscaping that are considered acceptable.					
Provision to protect existing planting.	A condition shall be placed planting to be retained and	,		<u> </u>		
Concern of overlooking from concentration of ground floor windows and doors.	Taking into consideration the separation distance of betweetween 6.6m – 13.6m from dwelling there shall be not a floor fenestrations.	een 10-15m to n the east bour	the wes	st boundary and om both sections of the		



Concern of	The small window on the gable of the front annex does not have a first-
overlooking from	floor element. No overlooking shall arise here.
small window in	
the gable end of	
the front annex.	
Onlook into site	The dwelling at No 21 sits at a lower ground level and taking account the
from neighbours'	existing and proposed planting schedule no unduly onlooking shall arise
side and from own	from No 21.
amenity space.	
Blinds included	The blinds cannot be conditioned as part of any decision notice. The
does not mitigate	separation distance, planting schedule including embellished hedging and
overlooking	new tree planting is considered appropriate to minimise any unduly loss
concerns and	of privacy and amenity.
evergreen note	
now removed.	
Tree planting	The tree and hedge planting schedule is considered appropriate to
ineffective and not	mitigate overlooking concerns. The plans are considered to be fully
adequate to stop	accurate.
overlooking and	
hedge planting	
embellishments	
not shown.	



Application Reference	LA05/2025/0468/F	Date Valid	25.06.2	025
Description of Proposal	Section 54 Application regarding Proposed Variation of Condition No. 2 (pre-commencement provision of access) of Planning Approval LA05/2020/0728/F relating to a change of house type at a consented residential development at lands at Derriaghy Road, Lisburn	Location		at Derriaghy Road ast of 7 and 9 Belmont Lisburn
Group Recommendation	Approval	Case Officer	Sinead	McCloskey
•	g material considerations have	e been satisfie	d.	
Representations				
	Support Letters	Objection Pet	itions	Support Patitions
Objection Letters 1	Support Letters N/A	Objection Pet N/A	itions	Support Petitions N/A
	N/A		itions	
Objection Letters 1	N/A		iitions	



Week Ending 19th September 2025

Item Number 7			
Application Reference	LA05/2025/0213/F	Date Valid	26.03.2025
Description of Proposal	Proposed construction of 2no. infill dwellings and detached garages with associated car parking and landscaping	Location	Lands between 6 and 8 Stoneyford Road, Lisburn
Group Recommendation	Refusal	Case Officer	Cara Breen

Reasons for Recommendation

- 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.
- The proposal is contrary to Policy COU8 of the Lisburn and Castlereagh City Council Plan Strategy, in that there is not a small gap sufficient to accommodate two dwellings within an otherwise substantial and continuously built-up frontage. Furthermore, the proposed scheme would not be appropriate to the existing plot size and width and the buildings forming the substantial and continuously built-up frontage are not visually linked. The proposal would add to a ribbon of development along Stoneyford Road.
- The proposal is contrary to Criterion (c), (e) and (i) of 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 access to the public road cannot be achieved without prejudice to road safety and significantly inconveniencing the flow of traffic.
- The proposal is contrary to Policy TRA2 of the Lisburn and Castlereagh City Council Plan Strategy, in that the proposal would prejudice road safety and significantly inconvenience the flow of vehicles and it would conflict with Policy TRA3 Access to Protected Routes.
- The proposal is contrary to Policy TRA3 of the Lisburn and Castlereagh City Council Plan Strategy, in that the proposal would not meet the criteria for development in the countryside, access cannot be reasonably achieved from an adjacent minor road, and the proposal would not make use of existing vehicular access onto the Protected Route.

Ke	pr	ese	ent	aτı	on	S

Objection Letters	Support Letters	Objection Petitions	Support Petitions
1	N/A	N/A	N/A



Consideration of Objections				
Issue	Consideration of Issue			
Impact of septic tank and soakaway.	NI Water, DAERA Water Mand Dfl Rivers were all consapplication. In their final correlation to the proposed devinformatives with any approhave no concern in respect	sulted as part of the pronsultation responses, the velopment, subject to the val. In light of these res	ecessing of the ey offer no concern in the inclusion of sponses, the Council	
Why is the proposal not connected to Main sewer.	The application has been so therefore that is what has be such NI Water, DAERA Wallealth and Dfl Rivers were application. In their final correlation to the proposed devinformatives with any appropriate the proposed for the proposed devinformatives with any appropriate the proposed devinformatives with any appropriate the proposed devinformatives with any appropriate the proposed devined the proposed devinformatives with any appropriate the proposed devined the proposed devined the proposed devined deviation of the proposed deviation	een considered by the ofter Management Unit, Leall consulted as part of insultation responses, the velopment, subject to the oval. In light of these res	Council. In relation to CCC Environmental the processing of the ey offer no concern in the inclusion of sponses, the Council	