

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

Week Ending 8th August 2025

Item Number 1			
Application Reference	LA05/2025/0202/F	Date Valid	25.03.2025
Description of Proposal	Proposed roofspace conversion and rear dormer with ridge height to be raised 300mm, change of rear window to patio doors	Location	10 Killowen Park, Lisburn,
Group Recommendation	Approval	Case Officer	Callum Henderson
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		
Overdevelopment	The concerns were considered in the above assessment, in relation to the design and potential for overbearing development, it is considered that the 300mm increase in the ridge height is modest and would not materially alter the design of the dwelling nor impact upon the character of the local area. The dormer, while stretching the width of the dwelling, would sit behind the roof when viewed from the front elevation and therefore would be minimally viewable from the front elevation and would not cause harm to the character of the area.		
Privacy	In relation to the potential for loss of privacy, the separation distances from rear to rear of those along Ballymacash Road are 45.0m at a minimum, additionally, any views or overlooking to neighbours adjacent at No. 8 or 12 Killowen Park would be oblique views therefore limiting the potential for adverse privacy concerns.		

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

Week Ending 8th August 2025

Item Number 2			
Application Reference	LA05/2023/0494/F	Date Valid	14.06.2023
Description of Proposal	Conversion of and single storey extension to disused mill to provide 1 no. dwelling and associated site works	Location	Approx 33m southwest of 18 Gransha Close Comber
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 & Castlereagh City Council Plan Strategy, in that it is not considered that this proposal would be a type of development which is acceptable in the countryside that will contribute to the aims of sustainable development. The proposal is contrary to Policy COU4 of the Lisburn & Castlereagh City Council Plan Strategy, in that it is not considered that this proposal would result in a sympathetic conversion of a vernacular building or suitably locally important building for use as a single dwelling where this would secure its upkeep and retention. The proposal is contrary to Policy COU4 of the Lisburn & Castlereagh City Council Plan Strategy, in that it has not been adequately demonstrated that the building is reasonably capable of being made structurally sound or otherwise improved. The proposal is contrary to Policy COU4 (b) of the Lisburn & Castlereagh City Council Plan Strategy, in that it would not maintain or enhance the form, character and architectural features, design and setting of the existing building and would have an adverse effect on the character or appearance of the locality. The proposal is contrary to Policy COU4 (c) of the Lisburn & Castlereagh City Council Plan Strategy, in that it is not considered the proposed new extension is sympathetic to the scale and massing of the existing building. The proposal is contrary to Policy COU15 (f) of the Lisburn & Castlereagh City Council Plan Strategy, in that it is not considered the design of the building is appropriate for the site and its locality. 			
Representations			
Objection Letters	Support Letters	Objection Petitions	Support Petitions
12	1	N/A	N/A
Consideration of Objections			

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

Week Ending 8th August 2025

Issue	Consideration of Issue
Development is contrary to Policy COU4 and SPPS.	The objection queries the existing structure as a 'locally important building' in the context of Policy COU4. It is noted, however that as per the policy a 'Locally Important Building' is a building, structure or feature, whilst not statutory listed, has been identified by the Council as an important part of their heritage, due to its local architectural or historic significance. In this case the Council has not identified any such buildings through the LDP process.
The original building and its purpose will be lost with proposed design.	It is contended that the proposed extension is significantly larger than the original structure and given views of the site would not maintain or enhance its relationship with the existing structure. It is noted that the existing structure is in a poor condition and lacks obvious architectural features which would provide a link to its historical use or purpose.
The removal of any adjacent trees would likely severely compromise the existing stone walls already in poor condition, which may result in a 'new build' by default.	Due to the level of vegetation within and close to the existing structure that removal of this would have the potential to impact on the structural integrity of the buildings. The structural assessment submitted with this application has not adequately addressed this issue.
Concerns that the stone wall at the bridge will have to be removed to accommodate visibility splays which would have a visual impact.	The latest plans show that the parapet wall is to be unaltered, with retention of this not impacting on the 2 x 42m visibility splays. DfI Roads have been consulted and have raised no objection.
Not clear how the application will reduce the ground levels in order to provide the requirements for the visibility splays or affect the bridge.	DfI Roads have advised that there is kerbing located 600mm from the wall and back filled with concrete, which appears like a normal roadside verge. The kerb height exceeds 300 mm at points along the frontage of the parapet wall; therefore it will not be possible to lower it to below 250 mm. As it would not impede a driver's sight line along the length of the required visibility splays to any approaching vehicles, there are no concerns to the final verge/kerbing level slightly exceeding 250 mm.
There is a blind corner at the entry which would cause significant risk when existing the site.	The drawing details as provided have been fully consulted with DfI Roads who have no issues with the visibility splays or forward sight distance demonstrated.

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

Week Ending 8th August 2025

Additional traffic generation on narrow road.	The application is for a single dwelling. Following further consultation with DfI Roads it is not envisaged that the scale of this proposal would warrant the refusal on the basis of an unacceptable level of traffic generation.
Septic tank is in the floodplain and too close to proposed building.	Under the most up-to-date plans the septic tank is not located in the 1 in 100-year floodplain. NIEA Water Management Unit and Environmental Health have been consulted and have not raised objections to the proposed location, subject to the approval of discharge consent.
The site is located in an area of known flooding through.	A Flood Risk Assessment has been submitted, and it has been determined that the proposed building is located outside of the 1% AEP (2080) floodplain. DfI Rivers have been consulted and have raised no objection. On that basis it is not considered that the proposal would lead to flooding on the site or further downstream.
Removal of stone wall along bridge would currently also hold back floodwater from road.	The latest plans show that the parapet wall is to be unaltered.
It is questionable whether the applicant is in 'actual possession' of the existing stone wall to the bridge, which is within the application site.	As noted, the amended plans show that the visibility splays do not require the removal of this stone wall and therefore will not be affected by the proposal. The remainder of the visibility splay will be over the application site and public road.
The existing and proposed floor plans show the same thickness of walls which is misleading as the need for insulation/tanking to meet building regulations will likely make the conversion walls much thicker.	The requirement for insulation to meet building regulations would be considered under separate legislation, however it is not contended that any reduction in the internal space would result in the development being contrary to planning policy.
The provision of a new ground floor at least 150mm above the external ground level in accordance with building regulations and	The mezzanine element of the proposal only makes up a small portion of the total floorspace of the dwelling. From the plans submitted it is unclear what this area will be used for. In this case this could not be a reason for refusal and would be subject to assessment by building control.

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

Week Ending 8th August 2025

the FRA would compromise available heights at first floor and make plans shown unviable	
Tree removal and ecological impact.	An updated site layout plan indicates the trees to be removed, trees retained and additional trees to be planted. Due to the topography of the site and immediate area, as well as the trees to be retained and additional planting, it is not envisaged that a dwelling on this site would result in unacceptable visual impact. Natural Environment Division have been consulted and have not raised concerns over biodiversity.
It was requested that trees on the site should be protected.	It has been determined that the trees on site do not satisfactorily meet the required six criteria under legislation for establishing a TPO. In particular, issues were the position of the trees in the sunken topography combined with the rural nature of the locality and lack of distinctiveness compared with surrounding trees as well as the poor health and condition of some of the trees.
There are two retained trees within 5 metres of the building which may cause insurance issues.	Insurance for the property would be outside the remit of planning.
Invasive species have been present and are identified on the site.	The Ecological Statement has advised that Himalayan Balsam has been found on the site. NED have been consulted and have raised no issue. Management or removal of such species would be undertaken under separate legislation. NED Standing Advice would apply.
Invasion of privacy of neighbouring dwelling.	The distance from and its orientation towards the front of No 18 would limit the potential adverse impacts on amenity including overlooking. The site is also close to No 15 to the west however the distance between the proposed dwelling and existing is approximately 50 metres and is divided by a thick area of mature planting.
Proposal does not 'protect the established rural pattern' of Gransha Close in terms of spacing of dwellings.	The site is located in an area that is characterised by scattered detached dwellings and agricultural development. It is contended that the reuse of the existing structure on this site would not result in an adverse impact on the established rural pattern in the area.
Potential for building to be used as a short-term rental.	The application has been submitted to provide 1 no. dwelling and not to provide a short-term rental and must be considered on the basis of what has been applied for. Should it be used solely as a short term let consideration will be taken of whether enforcement action is necessary.
No need for the development in this location.	This proposal has been submitted to the Council as a proposed conversion of an existing structure. In this case it is not considered that the proposal fully complies with Policy COU4 of the Local Development Plan Strategy.

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

Week Ending 8th August 2025

Lack of light for proposed development.	While there are trees adjacent to the site, mainly to the west, a dwelling on this site should retain an acceptable amount of light from the east and south, and as such would not form a reason for refusal.
Request has been made to consider additional protection for this structure through the local plan.	The mechanism through which council may consider identification of Historic Buildings of Local Importance is through the Local Development Plan (LDP). The council is only commencing formulation of its Local Plan Policy, this may take some time to produce, and Councils are free to decide on a process which is suitable for their needs which is clear/ logical and may reflect that used to identify listed buildings.