

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

**Week Ending 11 June 2021**

<b>Item Number 1</b>			
<b>Application Reference</b>	LA05/2020/0952/F	<b>Date Valid</b>	18.11.2020
<b>Description of Proposal</b>	Stables for keeping of horses (for domestic purposes) including access and paddock	<b>Location</b>	Opposite and south east of 123 Ballynahinch Road Dromore
<b>Group Recommendation</b>	Refusal	<b>Case Officer</b>	Richard McMullan
<b>Reasons for Recommendation</b>			
<p>The proposal is contrary to Policy CTY8 of Planning Policy Statement 21, Sustainable Development in the Countryside in that the proposal would, if permitted, result in the creation of ribbon development along the Ballynahinch Road, Dromore.</p> <p>The proposal is contrary to Policy CTY13 of Planning Policy Statement 21, Sustainable Development in the Countryside, in that the proposed site lacks long established natural boundaries/is unable to provide a suitable degree of enclosure for the development to integrate into the landscape and as a consequence the development would rely primarily on the use of new landscaping for integration purposes and therefore would not visually integrate into the surrounding landscape.</p> <p>The proposal is contrary to Policy CTY14 of Planning Policy Statement 21, Sustainable Development in the Countryside in that the development would, if permitted create a ribbon of development along the Ballynahinch Road, Dromore and would therefore result in a detrimental change to (further erode) the rural character of the countryside.</p> <p>The proposal is contrary to Policy OS3 of Planning Policy Statement 8 (PPS 8) Open Space, Sport and Outdoor Recreation in that it would have an adverse impact on the visual amenity/character of the local landscape as it would not be readily absorbed into the local landscape by virtue of being able to take advantage of existing landscaping. It would also be unsympathetic to the surrounding environment in terms of its siting, layout and landscape treatment.</p>			
<b>Representations</b>			
<b>Objection Letters</b>	<b>Support Letters</b>	<b>Objection Petitions</b>	<b>Support Petitions</b>
0	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>Consideration of Objections</b>			
<b>Issue</b>	<b>Consideration of Issue</b>		

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

**Week Ending 11 June 2021**

<b>Item Number 2</b>			
<b>Application Reference</b>	LA05/2018/1168/F	<b>Date Valid</b>	15.11.2018
<b>Description of Proposal</b>	Proposed demolition of existing two storey semi-detached dwellings and erection of two, two storey detached dwellings, relocation and alteration to access and associated site works	<b>Location</b>	Lands to the south west and adjacent to 53 Dromore Road Hillsborough
<b>Group Recommendation</b>	Approval	<b>Case Officer</b>	Grainne Rice
<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>
9	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>Consideration of Objections</b>			
<b>Issue</b>	<b>Consideration of Issue</b>		
Factual inaccuracies, typographical errors in submission.	During the processing of this application amended drawings and associated documents have been provided. It is contended there is sufficient information provided to make a full assessment and the information submitted meets the relevant policy requirements.		
Proposal would result in the loss of TPO trees.	<p>The dwellings and ancillary works as previously approved at outline planning stage would require a significant proportion of TPO tree removal to facilitate the development to the front of the site hence the change in siting to the rear.</p> <p>A total of 10 trees would be removed of which 4 are TPO trees to enable the development. It is acknowledged that during the processing of the application 4 TPO trees previously identified to be removed are now to be retained. TPO trees will be removed to facilitate the construction of a driveway and clearance of sightlines and service runs for the proposed development which were previously approved under planning application LA05/2016/0670/O. To ensure all trees to be retained are not adversely affected by the proposed development necessary planning conditions will be applied to any potential decision notice. Planning conditions will only apply to development within the red line of the application site.</p>		

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

**Week Ending 11 June 2021**

<p>Loss of ecological habitat.</p>	<p>NIEA Natural Environment Division were consulted on the application and considers that the proposed development would not have a significant impact on protected species or habitats. Necessary informatives will be included in a decision notice.</p>
<p>Works carried out on the site have breached planning conditions of previous outline approval.</p>	<p>This is a full planning application which will be assessed on its own merits taking into account all materials considerations including the planning history. A separate application for consent for works to protected trees ref LA05/2018/1206/TPO was submitted in tandem with this application. This will issue separately once a decision is made on this application.</p>
<p>Potential loss of amenity to No. 53 Dromore Road, loss of privacy, overbearing effect.</p>	<p>Amended plans were received moving the proposed dwellings in a south westerly direction improving the separation distance with No. 53 Dromore Road. The nearest proposed dwelling is now 18m from the property boundary of No. 53 Dromore Road. The separation distances, orientation of the proposed dwellings and existing and proposed landscaping and boundary treatment would ensure that the design and layout will not conflict with adjacent land uses and there is no unacceptable adverse effect on existing or proposed properties in terms of overlooking, loss of light, overshadowing, noise or other disturbance.</p>
<p>The proposed siting is not within the existing curtilage of the existing building. Elevated position – not in line with previous outline approval. The proposed style of the dwellings is not appropriate to the rural setting.</p>	<p>The site benefits from planning permission (LA05/2016/0670/O) for the replacement of semi-detached dwellings with a pair of detached dwellings and the application site boundaries remain the same as previously approved. At the full design stage in order to retain the maximum trees other than those necessary for development the proposed dwellings have been set back into the site. This would allow maximum screening to be retained for integration and reduce the amount needing removed. There are a number of single dwellings within the immediate vicinity of the site and a variety of house types in the area in terms of scale, appearance and design. It is contended that the design of the dwellings is acceptable.</p>
<p>The proposal does not meet the requirements of Policy CTY 3 Replacement Dwellings under PPS 21.</p>	<p>The principle of 2 no. detached dwellings, relocation and alteration to access and associated site works has been granted under the outline planning application LA05/2016/0670/O. This full planning application seeks to detail these two dwellings towards the less densely treed area to the rear of the site. It is contended this would allow maximum screening to be retained for integration and retention of more trees. The proposed design of the dwellings is in keeping with the surrounding countryside and it typical of a style of design which has been approved in the rural area.</p>

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

**Week Ending 11 June 2021**

<b>Item Number 3</b>			
<b>Application Reference</b>	LA05/2020/1041/F	<b>Date Valid</b>	08.12.2020
<b>Description of Proposal</b>	Demolition of existing sun-lounge and provision of single storey extension to rear of dwelling and provision of loft conversion including dormers to front and rear elevations	<b>Location</b>	2 Frankhill Park Carryduff
<b>Group Recommendation</b>	Approval	<b>Case Officer</b>	Hannah Luke
<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>		
Neighbouring privacy.	<p>An objection was received relating to loss of privacy from proposed windows and potential loss of light. A new window servicing the stairwell will be added to the left hand side elevation, which would sit slightly above the existing fence line and higher than the existing window. Amendments were requested and received which obscured this window. The proposed window to the utility room will be situated in the same position as the existing window, therefore I do not consider that leaving this window unobscured will cause additional loss of privacy.</p> <p>Furthermore, a new 1.8m timber fence will be constructed on the boundary between 25 Ballynahinch Road to hide these windows. Neighbour notification has been conducted following receipt of amended plans and no further objections were received.</p> <p>Proposed windows within the box dormer are oriented towards the south, and do not have a direct view into neighbouring gardens. Instead, they will look past neighbouring gardens towards the south.</p>		
Loss of light.	Regarding loss of light, the bulk of the extension is situated beyond the boundary wall of no. 25 Ballynahinch Road. The existing rear return – projecting 2.2m from the rear wall, is 3.6m in height, and the sunroom is		

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

**Week Ending 11 June 2021**

	<p>3.2m – projecting 11.1m from the rear wall. The proposed extension is 4m in height. It is not considered that this increase in height will cause loss of light to an unacceptable degree.</p>
Scale & design.	<p>The bulk of the changes will take place to the rear of the dwelling, with the exception of the creation of 3 dormers. A number of properties have been expanded in the same way, with the creation of dormers to the front elevation. While the dwellings within Frankhill Park are regular in form and appearance, the area is one of limited architectural interest. The proposed dormers appear as an integral part of the dwelling's roof. It is not considered that the dormers detract unacceptably from the dwelling or the character of the area. The rest of the alterations will take place to the rear of the property, and will not be immediately visible from the public street.</p>

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

**Week Ending 11 June 2021**

<b>Item Number 4</b>			
<b>Application Reference</b>	LA05/2020/0174/F	<b>Date Valid</b>	25.02.2020
<b>Description of Proposal</b>	The installation of a 20 metre Apollo street pole with 6no. antennas (3 enclosed within a shroud) 2 equipment cabinets, 1 meter cabinet and ancillary apparatus/ works	<b>Location</b>	Footpath on Robbs Road in front of 46 Robbs Road (vacant industrial unit) Dundonald Belfast
<b>Group Recommendation</b>	Approval	<b>Case Officer</b>	Cara Breen
<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>
2	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>Consideration of Objections</b>			
<b>Issue</b>	<b>Consideration of Issue</b>		
Location of equipment makes it visually obtrusive.	It is contended that the location of the equipment is acceptable and in accordance with PPS 10 and DCAN 14. It would have a backdrop of an industrial building/foilage and the equipment has been designed (through choice of colours/size) to assimilate with said backdrop and the existing street furniture in the vicinity.		
Assessment of alternatives is not robust – better sites available.	A total of 16 other sites, to include mast/site sharing, were explored as outlined in the Supporting Information document. Detailed explanation of why they have been discounted and why this proposed site has been chosen has been provided and is considered acceptable.		
Impact on residential amenity.	The proposal is located a distance of 16m+ from the closest neighbouring residential property. LCCC Environmental Health have been consulted as part of the processing of the application and offer no objection. It is noted that the Planning system and Planning policy do not exist to protect views from private property.		
Impact future development of No. 46.	The application is assessed based on the current situation on the ground at the time of consideration. No application for No. 46 is currently under consideration by the Council. The proposal would be positioned on the		

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

**Week Ending 11 June 2021**

	footpath outside of No. 46 and to the south west of the existing vehicular access.
Create clutter on the footpath.	DfI Roads have been consulted as part of the processing of the application and have subsequently responded with no concerns, subject to the inclusion of a stipulated condition, outlined in their response, with any approval.
Hercules cabinet.	Clarification has been sought regarding the reference to the Hercules cabinet in the accompanying Supporting Information. The agent has provided written confirmation that the proposal is as per the description on the submitted P1 Form and as outlined on the submitted plans.
Contrary to PPS 10 and DCAN 14.	The proposal has been assessed and is considered to conform to Policy TEL 1 of Planning Policy Statement 10: Telecommunications and DCAN 14: Siting and Design of Radio Telecommunications Equipment.

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

**Week Ending 11 June 2021**

<b>Item Number 5</b>			
<b>Application Reference</b>	LA05/2020/0736/F	<b>Date Valid</b>	22.09.2020
<b>Description of Proposal</b>	Single storey rear extension and erection of first floor structure to provide first floor bedroom accommodation.	<b>Location</b>	50 Brerton Crescent Ballydolagan Belfast
<b>Group Recommendation</b>	Approval	<b>Case Officer</b>	Sinead McCloskey
<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>
2	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>Consideration of Objections</b>			
<b>Issue</b>	<b>Consideration of Issue</b>		
Restriction of natural light.	Given the separation distance and layout of buildings it is considered that there will be minimal loss of light towards the dwelling at No. 11 Brerton Crescent. It is also felt that there will be no overshadowing as a result of the proposal.		
The view from No. 11 will be replaced with a substantial span of brick or render.	Whilst the right to a view is a material consideration, it is not given determining weight in this instance.		
The proposed development has been unsettling and has caused stress.	Any personal effects/decisions caused by a proposal is unfortunately outside of the remit of planning.		
The application was described for a single storey extension however the drawings were for a double storey extension.	The agent was contacted regarding the proposal description and an amended application form was submitted with the description included to state that there would be the erection of a first floor structure. All the neighbours were re-neighbour notified accordingly.		
Detrimental impact to the value of their home.	Whilst property value is a material consideration, it is not given determining weight in this instance.		

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

**Week Ending 11 June 2021**

Item Number 6			
<b>Application Reference</b>	LA05/2020/0927/F	<b>Date Valid</b>	12.11.2020
<b>Description of Proposal</b>	Change of house type design to that previously approved under planning reference S/2011/0660/F	<b>Location</b>	27 Culcavey Road Hillsborough
<b>Group Recommendation</b>	Approval	<b>Case Officer</b>	Margaret Manley
Reasons for Recommendation			
All relevant planning material considerations have been satisfied.			
Representations			
<b>Objection Letters</b>	<b>Support Letters</b>	<b>Objection Petitions</b>	<b>Support Petitions</b>
10	N/A	N/A	N/A
Consideration of Objections			
<b>Issue</b>	<b>Consideration of Issue</b>		
Dwelling not built in accordance with previously approved plans or plans as submitted under current application.	This application seeks to regularise those parts of the dwelling which are not built in accordance with the earlier approval. Any development not carried out in accordance with approved plans is done so at the developer's own risk and may be liable to enforcement action from the Council if required. Amended drawings have been submitted through the processing of this application to accurately reflect the house which has been constructed.		
Dwelling too close to southern boundary and potential negative impact on vegetation along this boundary.	The extension to the south gable does bring the proposed dwelling closer to the southern boundary and therefore closer to the existing boundary hedge. Natural Environment Division (NED) were consulted in relation to this proposal and have considered all letters of objection. They did not raise any concerns regarding potential threat to the health of this boundary hedge.		
Dwelling in too close proximity to pond.	NED and Rivers Agency have been consulted and have not raised any concerns regarding the dwelling's proximity to the pond.		
Negative impact on wildlife.	Following consideration of a Preliminary Ecological Assessment submitted by the applicant NED are content with the proposal subject to conditions and informatives to protect wildlife.		
Negative impact of artificial lighting on bats and pond.	NED have noted both bats and otters are highly sensitive to artificial lighting but are content with the proposal subject to a suitably worded external lighting condition.		

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

**Week Ending 11 June 2021**

Removal of trees protected by Tree Preservation Orders and lack of replacement planting and landscape strategy.	A Replanting Schedule and Tree Constraints Plan has been submitted and to the satisfaction of the Council's Tree Officer. TPO trees have been removed under agreement with the Councils TPO Officer subject to the replanting schedule agreed.
Inadequate sightlines.	Roads Service have been consulted in relation to this proposal. They are satisfied a safe access and egress is provided in accordance with the standards noted in DCAN15.
Insufficient parking and turning space to front of dwelling.	Roads Service are satisfied there is sufficient parking and turning space within the curtilage of the dwelling.
Insufficient amenity space to serve proposed dwelling.	The proposed site layout plan indicates the dwelling will be served by amenity space provided in a paved patio area and a paved walkway to the rear. It will also be served by amenity space provided in a balcony area at first floor level. Overall the proposal provides an adequate level of amenity space in keeping with the 70m <sup>2</sup> recommended in the design guide 'Creating Places.'
Unauthorised change in land form and levels and artificial raised bank close to pond.	A site layout plan showing existing and proposed levels throughout the site has been provided. A cross section showing the proposed dwelling in the context of the application site and existing and proposed levels has also been submitted. The change in levels as shown on these proposed plans is considered acceptable. No concerns were raised by any of the statutory consultees regarding the change in levels.
Negative impact of chemically treated swimming pool on wildlife/ Assurance that no drainage from chemically treated swimming pool will be discharged into pond.	<p>NED did not raise any concerns regarding any potential negative implications on wildlife arising from the swimming pool.</p> <p>Any discharge from the swimming pool into a watercourse would require consent from DfI Rivers and does not fall within the remit of planning.</p>
Assurance required that oil heating tanks shall be secured to prevent spillage into pond.	<p>An oil heating tank has not been shown on the proposed plans. There have been no statutory objections from competent authority around potential contamination from oil spillage into the pond.</p> <p>NI Direct advises anyone who uses, stores, fills, transports or manufactures hazardous substances, such as oils, is responsible for making sure the substance is contained and used in a way that won't result in a release to the environment. They're also responsible for cleaning-up any spills and deal with any consequences of the release. NI Direct also advises "If oil has or could enter drains or the water environment (groundwater, ponds, burns, rivers, loughs, estuaries or coastal waters) you must contact the <a href="#">Northern Ireland Environment Agency</a> immediately on their water pollution hotline.'</p>



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

**Week Ending 11 June 2021**