

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

Week Ending 18th September 2020

Item Number 1			
Application Reference	LA05/2019/0421/F	Date Valid	16.04.2019
Description of Proposal	Proposed change of use to ground floor premises at no. 51 and no. 53 Bridge Street, Lisburn from retail to 2 no. 1 bed apartments. Provision of additional ground floor windows to front elevation to replace existing shop fronts.	Location	51 & 53 Bridge Street Lisburn
Group Recommendation	Approval	Case Officer	Rachel Taylor
Reasons for Recommendation			
All relevant planning material considerations have been satisfied.			
Representations			
Objection Letters	Support Letters	Objection Petitions	Support Petitions
1	1	N/A	N/A
Consideration of Objections			
Issue	Consideration of Issue		
Property under development piecemeal for 8 years	Application ref S/09/0778/F involved the refurbishment of the ground floor shops, the change of use of the upper floors to apartments and a new 3 storey rear extension to create 6 new apartments. This was approved on the 10 th Jan 2010. The remainder of the site has been developed with the exception of the retail units which are no longer viable and been lying vacant. There is no restriction on a developer to complete a development therefore this application will be decided on its own merits.		
Original permission for ground floor retail units which was in keeping with rules enforced on rest of Bridge Street developers to protect other businesses and secure footfall.	It is acknowledged that businesses are encouraged to retain business use at ground floor, which is still the case, but each application is assessed on its own merits. The applicant has retained an active frontage onto Bridge Street which will protect and enhance the character of the conservation area and it is acknowledged that Bridge Street had a mixture of retail and residential uses.		
This is a commercial decision without consideration of	It is envisaged that rather than lying derelict, bringing this building back into use with an active frontage is an enhancement. There were 17 vacant ground floor shop units in Bridge Street upon a survey carried		

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

Week Ending 18th September 2020

other business owners and sets a precedent for others.	out by the agent many of which have not been occupied for several years. There is no demand for this size of small retail shop as demonstrated by the vacancy rates and a high demand to get people back living in the city centre.
--	---

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

Week Ending 18th September 2020

Item Number 2			
Application Reference	LA05/2020/0353/F	Date Valid	18.05.2020
Description of Proposal	Pitched roof extension to first floor area at rear of property, over existing sunroom. Provide new mono pitch roof with roof light over existing kitchen at junction with garage	Location	72 Greenburn Way Lisburn
Group Recommendation	Approval	Case Officer	Joseph Billham
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		
Increase overall mass of two storey dwelling by a third.	The first floor rear extension extends 4m from the rear of the existing dwelling and does not exceed the existing ridge height. The scale and massing of the proposal are considered to be subordinate with the existing property. It is considered the proposal will not dominate the character of the existing building.		
Loss of light/Impact on amenity	The proposed 2 nd floor extension does not extend the full length over the extension on the ground floor which will reduce the impact on adjacent properties in terms of loss of light and amenity. The 45 degree light test was conducted as per Figure 1 of Planning Policy Statement 7 (Addendum): Residential Extensions and Alterations to assist in assessing any potential loss of light/overshadowing to neighbouring property. Drawing 01 indicates the proposal met the test, and therefore there are no concerns regarding loss of light/ or overshadowing on adjacent properties.		
Rear extension creates unacceptable precedent in the area.	The extension is located at the rear of the dwelling and will not exceed the existing ridge height. The proposal is not visible from critical viewpoints on Greenburn Way and will not have a detrimental impact on the character of the area. Each individual application is considered on its own merits.		

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

Week Ending 18th September 2020

Item Number 3			
Application Reference	LA05/2020/0015/F	Date Valid	08.01.2020
Description of Proposal	New vehicular access to serve existing commercial glasshouses	Location	45m South of 3 Bushfield Road Moira
Group Recommendation	Approval	Case Officer	Richard McMullan
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		
Applicant has gained three planning approvals recently and is destroying rural character of the area.	Each application is assessed on its own merits. Previous approvals would not have any influence upon the assessment of an application.		
Parking of lorries on the road blocking the road.	The blocking of the public highway would fall outside the remit of planning control and the remit of this planning application.		
Any new entrance should be to current standards.	Within the processing of this application Transportni have been consulted and can be seen to have no objections. As such the development is considered to be policy compliant and acceptable.		
Previous damage has taken place to kerbs and lawn.	The alleged damaging of private property/3 rd party land would fall outside of the remit of planning control. This would be a civil matter.		
There is already an access serving the glasshouse via the 'upper yard area'.	All applications are assessed upon their own merits and in this case it is considered that the development as proposed is policy compliant. There is no 'need test' in respect of such an application.		

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

Week Ending 18th September 2020

Item Number 4			
Application Reference	LA05/2019/0807/F	Date Valid	07.08.2019
Description of Proposal	Demolition of existing public house and the construction of residential development consisting of 48no. cat 1 (elderly) apartments incorporating 33no. 3p2b and 15no. 2p1b apartments with associated landscaping and car parking.	Location	The Beechill Inn 14 Cedarhurst Road Belfast
Group Recommendation	Refusal	Case Officer	Mark Burns
Reasons for Recommendation			
<p>The proposed development is contrary to the SPPS Policy QD 1 (a), of Planning Policy Statement 7: Quality Residential Environments, in that the development does not respect the established residential context, and if permitted would result in unacceptable damage to the local character and environmental quality of the area in terms of its, layout, scale, form, proportions, massing, appearance and excessive hard surfaced areas.</p> <p>The proposal is contrary to policy QD1 of the Department's Planning Policy Statement 7: "Quality Residential Environments" in that it would if permitted be harmful to the living conditions of existing residents through dominance overshadowing and overlooking, resulting in a loss of residential amenity.</p> <p>The proposal is contrary to criteria (c) of Policy QD 1 of Planning Policy Statement 7: Quality Residential Environments, in that inadequate amenity space has been provided for the development.</p> <p>The proposal is contrary to Planning Policy Statement 3, Access, Movement and Parking, Policy AMP 2, in that it would, if permitted, prejudice the safety and convenience of road users since it has not been demonstrated that an access can be provided in accordance with the standards contained in the Department's 'Development Control Advice Note 15.</p> <p>The proposal is contrary to Planning Policy Statement 7, Quality Residential Environments, Policy QD 1, in that it would, if permitted, prejudice the safety and convenience of road users since an acceptable layout has not been shown that meets the requirements of the supplementary planning guidance 'Creating Places – Achieving Quality in Residential Developments'</p>			

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

Week Ending 18th September 2020

Representations			
Objection Letters	Support Letters	Objection Petitions	Support Petitions
13	1	N/A	N/A
Consideration of Objections			
Issue	Consideration of Issue		
Character of the area.	An objection has been raised that the proposal will impact on the character of the area. It is considered that the scale and bulk of Block 2 which is 3 storey's in height is out of keeping with the other buildings and dwellings in the area and will impact on the character of the area. This is reflective in the refusal reasons.		
Traffic/Parking.	An objection has been raised in relation to the additional traffic the proposal will generate and the number of spaces provided to serve the proposal. Dfi Roads were consulted in relation to the proposal and issues that they had raised have not been addressed. Dfi have therefore provided a refusal reason stating that if the proposal was permitted in its current form it could prejudice the safety and convenience of road users.		
Impact on Wildlife.	Objections have been raised stating that the proposal could impact on the existing wildlife on the site. The agent has submitted a number of surveys including a Preliminary Ecological Appraisal and a Preliminary Roost Assessment for Bats. Natural Heritage Division (NED) were consulted in relation to the proposal and stated that they considered it unlikely that the development will have any significant impact on the local bat population in the event of planning permission being granted.		
Overlooking.	An objection has been raised from existing residents in Royal Lodge stating that the proposal will overlook their property and private amenity space. The 3 storey apartment block at the rear of the site has windows and balconies on its rear elevation which are directed towards and will overlook the existing dwellings in Royal Lodge. This is reflected in the refusal reason.		
Scale, form, massing and design of buildings.	An objection has been raised in relation to the scale form and massing of the proposal. It is considered that the scale form massing and design of the proposal and in particular block 2 at the rear of the site is unacceptable and will have a detrimental impact on the character of the area and the residential amenity of existing dwellings.		
Demolition of existing Bar could damage foundations of dwellings.	An objection has been raised by a resident in Royal Lodge stating that the demolition of the existing bar which is only 1 metre from the site boundary could damage the foundations of her house. A contractor demolishing the existing building on site would have to show due diligence while carrying out any works to the site. Any damage to foundations at existing residential properties would be a civil matter.		

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

Week Ending 18th September 2020

Item Number 5			
Application Reference	LA05/2019/0239/F	Date Valid	12.03.2019
Description of Proposal	Erection of dwelling and garage in compliance with PPS21 CTY2A and SPPS	Location	South east of 55 Bailliesmills Road Cargacreevy Lisburn
Group Recommendation	Approval	Case Officer	Catherine Gray
Reasons for Recommendation			
All relevant planning material considerations have been satisfied.			
Representations			
Objection Letters	Support Letters	Objection Petitions	Support Petitions
0	N/A	N/A	N/A
Consideration of Objections			
Issue	Consideration of Issue		
Proposal does not comply with policy CTY2a.	The proposal sits within an existing cluster of development, the cluster appears as a visual entity in the landscape, it is associated with a cross roads, the site is enclosed and bound by development on two sides. The development of the site can be easily absorbed in to the cluster through rounding off and consolidation and it would not have a negative impact on residential amenity due to its positioning and the separation distances. The proposal complies with policy CTY2a.		
Proposal does not comply with policy CTY 13.	The assessment of integration is not a test of invisibility but how it is viewed from critical viewpoints and how it sits in the landscape. The proposal is enclosed by existing boundary treatments and would blend into the existing landform. It is considered that the proposal would integrate sufficiently into the countryside. The design complies with Building on Tradition and is considered to be appropriate for the site and it locality. The proposal complies with policy CTY 13.		
Landownership.	Land ownership is a legal issues and is not a planning consideration. The onus is on the applicant to ensure that they have ownership/control of all lands necessary to implement a planning approval.		