

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

**Week Ending 27th March 2026**

Item Number 1			
<b>Application Reference</b>	LA05/2022/0725/F	<b>Date Valid</b>	02.08.2022
<b>Description of Proposal</b>	Construction of a dwelling to the rear of the site, with landscaping and all associated site works	<b>Location</b>	17-19 Main Street Hillsborough
<b>Group Recommendation</b>	Refusal	<b>Case Officer</b>	Sinead McCloskey
Reasons for Recommendation			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposal is contrary to criteria a) of Policy HOU3 of the Lisburn and Castlereagh Plan Strategy in that it does not respect the surrounding context and is not appropriate to the character and topography of the site in terms of layout and appearance of buildings.</li> <li>• The proposal is contrary to criteria b) of Policy HOU3 of the Lisburn and Castlereagh Plan Strategy in that it has not been satisfactorily demonstrated that the proposal protects the historic environment in the overall design and layout of the development.</li> <li>• The proposal is contrary to criteria a) of Policy HOU4 of the Lisburn and Castlereagh Plan Strategy in that the design of the development does not draw upon the best local architectural form and detailing.</li> <li>• The proposal is contrary to Policy HE5 of the Lisburn and Castlereagh Plan Strategy in that it has not been satisfactorily demonstrated that the development would not lead to the loss of or cause harm to the overall character and principal components of the Demesne of special historic interest.</li> <li>• The proposal is contrary to Policy HE6 of the Lisburn and Castlereagh Plan Strategy in that it has not been satisfactorily demonstrated that there would be no negative impacts on the listed building and that the features of special interest remain intact and unimpaired.</li> <li>• The proposal is contrary to Policy HE9 of the Lisburn and Castlereagh Plan Strategy in that it has not been satisfactorily demonstrated that the proposal would not adversely affect the setting of a listed building.</li> <li>• The proposal is contrary to Policy HE10 of the Lisburn and Castlereagh Plan Strategy in that the proposed development if permitted, would not enhance the character or appearance of the conservation area where an opportunity to do so exists, or preserve its character or appearance where an opportunity to enhance does not arise.</li> <li>• The proposal is contrary to criteria a), b) and d) of Policy HE10 of the Lisburn and Castlereagh Plan Strategy in that the development if permitted will impact on the setting of the Conservation Area as the development is not in sympathy with the characteristic</li> </ul>			

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

**Week Ending 27th March 2026**

built form of the area, the form and detailing do not respect the characteristics of adjoining buildings in the area and important views within, into and out of the area are not protected.			
Representations			
Objection Letters	Support Letters	Objection Petitions	Support Petitions
18	1	N/A	N/A
Consideration of Objections			
Issue	Consideration of Issue		
Protect my back garden against noise pollution of cars, dogs, outside lights – incurring extreme loss of privacy. Noise pollution in central Hillsborough is bad enough.	No concerns in regards to noise or lighting were raised by Environmental Health during the consultation process. Any undue noise or light pollution arising from the development should be reported to the Environmental Health Department of the Council who deal with such matters. Notwithstanding this the application is recommended for refusal for the reasons outlined in the above report.		
Putting an orchard is not evergreen trees.	There is no policy requirement for planting to be evergreen trees. An orchard is deemed acceptable in this context.		
Do not destroy our back gardens and privacy and hidden Hillsborough gardens. The proposed building is domineering.	The proposal is recommended for refusal as it does not respect the surrounding context and is not appropriate to the character of the site in terms of layout and appearance of buildings.		
Inappropriate extension to a listed building – contrary to Policy BH8.	This application does not relate to the extension of a listed building as it is for a single dwelling.		
Inappropriate new development in a Conservation Area – contrary to Policy BH12.	Policy BH12 has since been superseded by Policy HE10 of The Plan Strategy. As above, the proposal is contrary to Policy HE10 as it would not enhance the character or appearance of the Conservation Area, nor does it preserve its character or appearance.		
If approved unwelcome precedent for the Hillsborough Conservation Area. This development does not adhere to any of the	The application is recommended for refusal for several reasons as listed above, including Policy HE10 which relates specifically to new development in a Conservation Area.		

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

**Week Ending 27th March 2026**

conservation guidelines.	
The economic benefits do not outweigh the policy failures of the proposal.	There are no economic benefits listed in support of this application.
There already is a public house next door to the site which creates a lot of noise. There is a new development Arthurs and a lot of Airbnb's on the street, so there needs to be a balance between commercialisation and residential needs. It is another family home in the community lost to a business. The imbalance of having additional commercial activity close to the Palace grinds with the surrounding historic character of the village.	The application is for a dwelling house, not a commercial use. It is thought this comment may relate to the now approved adjacent application for the guest house in the dwellings at Nos. 17-19 Main Street.
An imbalance between commercialisation and a well-established street life residential activity is at odds with the heritage of the centre of the village.	The application is for a dwelling house, not a commercial use. It is thought this comment may relate to the now approved adjacent application for the guest house in the dwellings at Nos. 17-19 Main Street.
The proposed 11 bedrooms would increase the noise levels and disturbance of the village.	It is thought this comment may relate to the now approved adjacent application for the guest house in the dwellings at Nos. 17-19 Main Street.
The plans, length, shape and design of the new dwelling are out of character for the area, and the proposed building site has a dominant/commanding view over gardens	The application is found to be contrary to part a) of Policy HOU3 in that the proposal is not appropriate to the character and topography of the site. It is also thought to be contrary to part a) of Policy HOU4 in that the design of the development does not draw upon the best local architectural form and detailing. The assessment also found the dwelling has been positioned and designed on the site to reduce the potential for overlooking and overshadowing towards any adjoining properties.

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

**Week Ending 27th March 2026**

<p>across the road comprising the residents' privacy and daylight. This proposed modern design will be near the top of the hill and will dominate the entire stepped terraced gardens below. It will also be at right angles to all other stone buildings and would look out of character from any angle.</p>	
<p>The back gardens to the right of Main Street are well established in tradition and maturity and have a degree of historical ambience and connection to the castle.</p>	<p>The proposal is recommended for refusal as it does not respect the surrounding context and is not appropriate to the character of the site in terms of layout and appearance of buildings. The proposal is also found to be contrary to Policy HE5 as it has not been demonstrated how the proposal relates to the protected Demesne Wall and that it would not cause harm to the overall character or setting of the demesne of special historic interest.</p>
<p>The back gardens are a natural oasis for wildlife between Main Street and the Royal Castle, with a high degree of Biodiversity, included bats, hedgehogs, foxes, jays, woodpeckers and a rookery. Swifts nest at the front and back of No. 11/13 on the Main Street.</p>	<p>A Preliminary Ecological Assessment and Bat Survey Report was submitted in receipt of the application and sent to NIEA Natural Environment Division for consultation. They responded stating that they had considered the impact of the proposal and had no concerns.</p>
<p>The proposal is at odds with Hillsborough's claim to be a Georgian village as they bring too many additional people to live on the Main Street and to destroy the pattern of the mature and maintained gardens at the rear. The building/design is neither in keeping with</p>	<p>Following consultation with the Council Conservation Officer the proposal is recommended for refusal as it does not respect the surrounding context and is not appropriate to the character of the site in terms of layout and appearance of buildings. It also thought that the design of the development does not draw upon the best local architectural form and detailing.</p>

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

**Week Ending 27th March 2026**

<p>the architecture or feeling of a Georgian village. Something more in keeping could be planned, not a building that would be at home somewhere in Scandinavia. Nowhere in the conservation area is cedar cladding used. The development is positioned at the bottom of the garden and is totally at odds to the rest of the residential properties. It will result in the loss of a substantial amount of garden.</p>	
<p>All the existing residential coach houses are set parallel to the main street these stone facades are in keeping in character with the old village architecture. The new proposed building would break this historical mould.</p>	<p>Following consultation with the Council Conservation officer the proposal is recommended for refusal as it does not respect the surrounding context and is not appropriate to the character of the site in terms of layout and appearance of buildings.</p>
<p>I note there is also a planning permission applied for in the two houses facing Main Street – is turning these into a guest house the best the planners can do?</p>	<p>The planning authority must accept valid applications and assess them, accordingly, having no control over what proposed developments are submitted. This adjacent application was assessed and found compliant with the appropriate policies and issued as an approval.</p>
<p>People looking down into our gardens, not neighbours but people who will come for a few days.</p>	<p>The assessment found the dwelling has been positioned and designed on the site to reduce the potential for overlooking towards any adjoining properties. The application is for a dwelling and not for tourism use.</p>
<p>I thought the Main Street is not allowed to alter the front of a building facing the street.</p>	<p>It is thought this comment may relate to the now approved adjacent application for the guest house in the dwellings at Nos. 17-19 Main Street as the application for the dwelling does not propose any alterations to buildings facing the street.</p>

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

**Week Ending 27th March 2026**

<p>A proposed fence is no compromise for a natural nature friendly hedge as a boundary</p>	<p>A fence is deemed an acceptable boundary treatment in an urban context. Notwithstanding this, the application is recommended for refusal.</p>
<p>I have no objection to the front of the building being developed, as long as the height follows the same height as the other houses but strongly object to the back development in breaking the traditional ambience and character of the historical town and the effect it would have on the present wildlife.</p>	<p>It is thought that the first part of this comment may relate to the now approved adjacent application for the guest house in the dwellings at Nos. 17-19 Main Street as the application for the dwelling does not propose any alterations to the buildings to the front. The dwelling to the rear is recommended for refusal as it is thought not to respect the surrounding context and is not appropriate to the character and topography of the site and the development is not in sympathy with the characteristic built form of the area.</p>
<p>The plans show parking for 3 cars, and the same applicant has a planning application in for eleven guest bedrooms and eight parking spaces on the same site.</p>	<p>DFI Roads have been consulted twice and offer no objection to the development, providing conditions to be attached to a decision. No concerns were raised by roads on the adjacent approved application.</p>
<p>The single width gate way on to the street was designed for the use of the houses either side with little domestic traffic. The fact that there could be up to eleven cars travelling in and out of the single width gateway to the parking spaces, crossing over the existing foot path would create an added danger to pedestrians. The main street traffic activity has increased greatly. Restricted visibility with parking both sides of the entrance</p>	<p>DFI Roads have been consulted twice and offer no objection to the development, providing conditions to be attached to a decision.</p>

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

**Week Ending 27th March 2026**

increase the chances of an accident.	
The narrow entrance, with a proposed wider opening would be out of proportion compared to the other similar entrances. This was designed and built for domestic use and not a commercial entrance.	It is thought this comment may relate to the now approved adjacent application for the guest house in the dwellings at Nos. 17-19 Main Street as the application is for a dwelling and not commercial use. The widening of the entrance was found to be acceptable in the approved application for the guest house.
The drawing six submitted showing the existing south elevation is incorrect. It in fact shows the proposed south elevation of another planning application. It would lead one to believe that the further planning application had been approved when it has not.	Drawing No. 6 shows plans of the adjacent application for the guest house. At the time these plans were submitted (2 <sup>nd</sup> August 2022) the guest house had not been approved (having since been approved on the 8 <sup>th</sup> of April 2025). It is noted that the plans as shown on this drawing were superseded and the agent has been requested to submit amended plans will all details of the adjacent guest house removed.
The Water Order Article 236 of the Water & Sewage Service NI (2006) has concerns how the new dwellings would reach the sewers if a pumping station was erected and how the new building would be built over the sewer? The sewage works is right beside our cottage what would the impact be?	NI Water have been consulted three times during the processing of this application, having initially recommended refusal for connection as a solution was not agreed between the developer and NI Water. Following an agreement having been reached with the applicant, NI Water issued a final response recommending approval subject to conditions. As such, there are no concerns in terms of sewer provision. It has been stated that there is a public foul sewer within 20m of the proposed development boundary. A condition has been provided stating that development shall not be begun until the applicant provides evidence that NI Water has confirmed that the proposed works will not affect the existing sewer infrastructure. No impact on adjoining properties has been identified by NI Water.
LA05/2020/0089/DCA and /0088F needs to be addressed first before any other planning should be considered. The old wall needs to be re-erected with original stone.	Both applications referred to have been returned as invalid as the development extended beyond the red line. The application sites as identified did not contain all of the development proposed.

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

**Week Ending 27th March 2026**

<p>The eyeline on the outside patio would be 2.5m above the present temporary wooden fence and significantly overlooking all the properties going down the hill – very obtrusive and would lower the property prices of all the houses.</p>	<p>The assessment found the dwelling has been positioned and designed on the site to reduce the potential for overlooking towards any adjoining properties. While the consideration of property values is a material consideration in the assessment of an application, it is not given determining weight as property prices can be impacted by many factors outside the remit of planning.</p>
<p>Too many holiday lets in Hillsborough? This brings in noise, more traffic in central Hillsborough, pollution etc. If anything, we need more diversity in the village.</p>	<p>The application is for a dwelling house, not a commercial use. It is thought this comment may relate to the now approved adjacent application for the guest house in the dwellings at Nos. 17-19 Main Street.</p>
<p>There is no basis now for having 'conservation' status on the streets in Hillsborough. A hotel is not needed nor welcome.</p>	<p>The application was considered by the Council Conservation officer and found contrary to Policy HE10, New Development in a Conservation Area. The application is for a dwelling house, not a commercial use. It is thought this comment may relate to the now approved adjacent application for the guest house in the dwellings at Nos. 17-19 Main Street</p>
<p>How long is this continual bombardment of applications going on for.</p>	<p>The Council cannot control the applications that are submitted for consideration. If they are deemed valid upon receipt they must be processed accordingly.</p>
<p>I did say once they get the front planning they will go for the garden. After 74 objections to the front our voice does not matter.</p>	<p>The Council cannot control the applications that are submitted for consideration. If they are deemed valid upon receipt they must be processed accordingly. Notwithstanding this, the application has been assessed and is recommended for refusal for the reasons outlined above. It is noted that 18 objections have been received in respect of this application.</p>
<p>Historic Royal Palaces record that the boundary wall shown is in Historic Royal Palaces actual possession... HRP have not considered this work, and no request has been received to carry out</p>	<p>A consultation was issued to Historic Environment Division to comment on the objection raised by HRP. They subsequently responded stating that they would agree with the general conclusion proposed, continuing that they have incomplete information which does not allow a substantive response on the impact of the proposed listed buildings, requesting further information.</p>

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

**Week Ending 27th March 2026**

<p>such works. The wall forms the boundary to the Hillsborough Castle Gardens and the curtilage of the listed building structures.</p>	
--	--

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

**Week Ending 27th March 2026**

<b>Item Number 2</b>			
<b>Application Reference</b>	LA05/2025/0665/F	<b>Date Valid</b>	17.09.2025
<b>Description of Proposal</b>	This application is to build a new detached dwelling in a large 12m wide side garden located adjacent to 80 Belsize Road. An existing single story side extension on 80 Belsize Road will be removed to make way for the new dwelling	<b>Location</b>	80a Belsize Road, Lisburn,
<b>Group Recommendation</b>	Approval	<b>Case Officer</b>	Emma Forde
<b>Reasons for Recommendation</b>			
All relevant planning material considerations have been satisfied.			
<b>Representations</b>			
<b>Objection Letters</b>	<b>Support Letters</b>	<b>Objection Petitions</b>	<b>Support Petitions</b>
1	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>Consideration of Objections</b>			
<b>Issue</b>	<b>Consideration of Issue</b>		
Impact of construction noise, and safety concerns regarding roads as a result of vehicles parking during construction.	It is not uncommon for a development site to generate noise, dust and general disturbance until the development is completed. These are considered to be normal impacts in relation to the development of land. The issue raised 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.		