

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

Week Ending 5th June 2026

Item Number 1			
Application Reference	LA05/2025/0928/F	Date Valid	23.12.2025
Description of Proposal	Side extension to provide rehabilitation services to Smart Physiotherapy & Fitness Clinic	Location	48 Ballynahinch Road, Belfast
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
1	N/A	N/A	N/A
Consideration of Objections			
Issue	Consideration of Issue		
Parking Impact.	<p>The proposed development would not result in any alteration to the existing site access or parking arrangements. It would not reduce the number of on-site parking spaces, nor would it compromise the existing parking layout. Adequate parking provision would be retained following completion of the works, and no issues in relation to highway safety are anticipated.</p> <p>DfI Roads were consulted in respect of the detached rehabilitation centre (approved under LA05/2025/0592/F) within the site's rear curtilage and raised no objection to that proposal. Given that the current application has been submitted as an alternative to that approved scheme, and that the proposed side extension is of a lesser scale and intended for an identical use, DfI Roads were not re-consulted in this instance.</p> <p>Planning permission LA05/2025/0592/F remains extant and the approved outbuilding could be lawfully implemented. In this context, the applicant was requested to provide supporting information demonstrating that, in the event both the proposed side extension and the approved outbuilding were constructed, there would be no adverse impact on the safety and convenience of the local highway network or on on-site parking provision.</p> <p>The applicant provided details of the existing booking and parking management system, which ensures that the site operates without generating excessive parking demand or overspill into the public domain or surrounding residential streets. The applicant has further clarified that,</p>		

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

Week Ending 5th June 2026

	<p>even in a scenario where both developments were implemented, there would be no increase in customer footfall or on-site parking demand, as staffing levels would not increase and, given the nature of the physiotherapy service, patient numbers are directly linked to staff capacity. Accordingly, the development would not result in intensified use of the site in terms of traffic generation or parking demand.</p> <p>Given that the proposed development would not result in any alteration to the existing site access or parking arrangements, and in the absence of any anticipated increase in customer footfall, it is considered that the development would not give rise to adverse impacts in respect of highway safety or on-site parking provision.</p>
Boundary Discrepancies.	<p>The initial plans submitted in support of the application did not accurately reflect the existing boundary treatments on site. However, amended plans have since been provided by the applicant which correctly depict the existing boundary arrangements, thereby resolving this matter.</p>
Local Topography.	<p>Due to the local topography, the adjacent dwelling at No.1 Meadowvale Park is situated at a lower ground level than the application site. This difference in levels is a material consideration in assessing potential impacts on residential amenity, including loss of privacy and overlooking.</p> <p>In terms of overlooking and loss of privacy, it is acknowledged that the application site occupies an elevated position relative to No. 1 Meadowvale Park and that the proposed side extension includes windows facing towards its side garden. However, no significant adverse impacts are anticipated. The proposed windows would comprise small high level openings, designed to admit natural light rather than to facilitate outward views. As such, any perception of overlooking or loss of privacy arising from the side elevation would be negligible.</p> <p>With respect to overshadowing and loss of light, the proposed flat-roofed extension would be of a modest height and would remain significantly lower than the main building. When considered alongside existing boundary treatments, vegetation, and the spatial separation between properties, the development is not expected to result in any unacceptable loss of light or overshadowing to neighbouring dwellings, including No.1 and No.2 Meadowvale Park.</p>