

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

Week Ending 22 January 2021

Item Number 1			
Application Reference	LA05/2020/0697/F	Date Valid	08.09.2020
Description of Proposal	Change of house type design to that previously approved under LA05/2017/1098/F	Location	50m south east of 40 Edentrillick Road Hillsborough
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
1	N/A	N/A	N/A
Consideration of Objections			
Issue	Consideration of Issue		
Site information plan contains a blue line designated area which should be corrected as per provided map.	Amended site location map provided by agent.		

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

Week Ending 22 January 2021

Item Number 2			
Application Reference	LA05/2020/0009/F	Date Valid	07.01.2020
Description of Proposal	New dwelling and double garage	Location	70 metres North of 316 Gilnahirk Road Belfast
Group Recommendation	Refusal	Case Officer	Cara Breen
Reasons for Recommendation			
<p>The proposal is contrary to the SPPS and Policy CTY 1 of PPS 21: Sustainable Development in the Countryside, in that there are no overriding reasons why the proposal is essential at this location.</p> <p>The proposal is contrary to the SPPS and Policy CTY 10(a) of PPS 21: Sustainable Development in the Countryside, in that it has not been demonstrated that the farm business is currently active and has been established for at least 6 years.</p> <p>The proposal is contrary to the SPPS and Policy CTY 13 of PPS 21: Sustainable Development in the Countryside, in that the site lacks long established natural boundaries and is unable to provide a suitable degree of enclosure for the building to integrate into the landscape and it would, if permitted, rely primarily on the use of new landscaping for the purposes of integration.</p>			
Representations			
Objection Letters	Support Letters	Objection Petitions	Support Petitions
0	N/A	N/A	N/A
Consideration of Objections			
Issue	Consideration of Issue		

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

Week Ending 22 January 2021

Item Number 3			
Application Reference	LA05/2019/1254/O	Date Valid	09.12.2019
Description of Proposal	Proposal for an infill dwelling	Location	Adjacent to the north east boundary of 61 Lakeland Road Hillsborough
Group Recommendation	Approval	Case Officer	Cara Breen
Reasons for Recommendation			
All relevant planning material considerations have been satisfied.			
Representations			
Objection Letters	Support Letters	Objection Petitions	Support Petitions
7	N/A	N/A	N/A
Consideration of Objections			
Issue	Consideration of Issue		
Access/additional traffic.	This application seeks Outline Planning permission for a single dwelling only. DfI Roads were consulted as part of the processing of the application and they subsequently responded with no concerns, subject to the inclusion of stipulated conditions with any approval.		
Not made aware of detail of dwelling.	The application is for Outline Planning permission only which seeks to establish the principle of development on the application site. Therefore, no design details have been provided, nor have they been requested by the Council. The design of the proposed dwelling would be considered in full should the application be approved and a Reserved Matters application be forthcoming within the required timeframe. Any approval would be subject to a condition requiring that the dwelling is in accordance with the Building on Tradition design guide and conditions relating to; ridge height/underbuild and siting in accordance with the existing building line.		
Potential overlooking/ Impact on amenity of neighbouring property.	The application is for Outline Planning permission only which seeks to establish the principle of development on the application site. Therefore, no design details have been submitted, nor have they been requested by the Council. It is however contended given the orientation of neighbouring properties in the context of their private amenity space, that there would not be any concerns with regards potential overlooking from a dwelling on the application site. LCCC Environmental Health were consulted as part of the processing of the application and subsequently responded with no concerns. Design details, including fenestration detailing and landscaping would be considered as part of any Reserved Matters application.		

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

Week Ending 22 January 2021

Previous application refused.	An application was submitted in 2002 under S/2002/1762/O for a new dwelling on the application site. This application was refused and a subsequent appeal (2003/A065) was dismissed. It is however acknowledged that this previous application was subject to a different Planning policy context. Applications for development in the countryside are now considered under Planning Policy Statement 21: Sustainable Development in the Countryside. It is considered by the Council that the application meets the exceptions text of Policy CTY 8 of PPS 21.
Two properties to south not in keeping with area and further dwelling would compromise nature of area.	This application is for Outline approval only which seeks to establish the principle of development on the application site. Therefore, no design details have been submitted, nor have they been requested by the Council. Design details would be considered in full should the application be approved and a Reserved Matters application be submitted. A condition would however be applied to any approval requiring that the dwelling is in accordance with the Building on Tradition design guide.
Too large to be considered for infill.	Policy CTY 8 of Planning Policy Statement 21 provides for an exception to which it is considered this application meets.
A dwelling would dominate 54.	The indicative layout depicts a dwelling set back approximately 42m from Lakeland Road in line with the existing residential properties immediately to the south of the application site. Conditions would be placed on any approval restricting ridge height/underbuild to no more than 7m above FFL with an underbuild of no more than 0.45m between existing ground level and FFL. A siting condition would also be placed on any approval requiring the dwelling to follow the existing building line. Taking these factors into account it is not perceived that a dwelling on the application site would dominate No. 54 Lakeland Road.
Reduce value of neighbouring property.	This is not a material Planning consideration of determining weight.
Existing Castlewellan Golds reduce light.	This is a civil matter and is outside the remit of Planning.
Impact on natural heritage/wildlife.	A NI Biodiversity Checklist was submitted to the Council on 18 th February 2020. DAERA Natural Environment Division were subsequently re-consulted and acknowledge receipt of said NI Biodiversity Checklist. In their consultation response, dated 22 nd April 2020, they offer no concerns with regards the proposal subject to the inclusion of stipulated conditions/informatives with any approval.
Applicant has no stake or interest in local community.	This is not a material Planning consideration of determining weight.

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

Week Ending 22 January 2021

Item Number 4			
Application Reference	LA05/2020/0419/O	Date Valid	11.06.2020
Description of Proposal	Proposed erection of 2no detached dwelling and garages (infill development)	Location	Lands between 38 and 36b Killultagh Road Lower Ballinderry Lisburn
Group Recommendation	Refusal	Case Officer	Sinead McCloskey
Reasons for Recommendation			
<p>The proposal is contrary to the SPPS and Policy CTY 1 of PPS 21 in that there are no overriding reasons why this development is essential and could not be located in a settlement, or it is otherwise allocated for development in a development plan.</p> <p>The proposal is contrary to the SPPS and Policy CTY 8 of Planning Policy Statement 21, Sustainable Development in the Countryside, in that it fails to meet the provisions for an infill dwelling as the application site does not respect the existing development pattern along the frontage in terms of size, scale, siting and plot size and would if permitted result in the addition of ribbon development</p> <p>The proposal is contrary to the SPPS and Policy CTY14 of Planning Policy Statement 21, Sustainable Development in the Countryside in that the development would, if permitted result in a suburban style build-up of development when viewed with existing and approved buildings and it would not, if permitted not respect the traditional pattern of settlement exhibited in the area and would therefore result in a detrimental change to the rural character of the countryside.</p>			
Representations			
Objection Letters	Support Letters	Objection Petitions	Support Petitions
3	N/A	N/A	N/A
Consideration of Objections			
Issue	Consideration of Issue		
Impact on pattern of Development	<p>The view is expressed that the site has the capacity to accommodate 5 dwellings when the maximum is two - it is at odds with Policy CTY8 0 also evident when comparing with the site approved under S/2010/1004/O for 2 dwellings between the dwellings at Nos. 36, 36a and 36b.</p> <p>The above assessment details that the site is capable of accommodating more than 2 dwellings and has been found unacceptable/</p>		
A similar application was refused by the	The previous planning application on this site was for 3 no. dwellings. Site history is a material consideration in the assessment of		

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

Week Ending 22 January 2021

planning committee some years ago.	all applications, but it must also be noted that the planning policy context has changed since then.
Impact on Character	<p>The view is expressed that further development on the Killultagh Road would alter the character of the area and disrupt the life cycles of resident wildlife including badgers, bats, hares and rabbits.</p> <p>The application was found to be contrary to Policy CTY14 and the rural character would have been altered as the application does not respect the traditional pattern of settlement. A biodiversity checklist had been completed and was sent to NIEA NED for comment. They stated that they were content that there was unlikely to be any significant impact on natural heritage (conditional on the submission of a new biodiversity checklist which was legible)</p>
An out of date map has been submitted not showing the dwellings at Nos. 36C and 36D.	Some maps may not have more recent developments mapped. However a site inspection confirmed the siting of these dwellings and formed part of the assessment accordingly.
Impact on Natural Heritage Interests.	<p>Concern is expressed that no ecological information has been submitted with the application and DAERA have provided no advice - there is plenty of established wildlife in the area.</p> <p>Natural Environment Division were consulted with a biodiversity checklist and ecological statement and stated that they were content that there was unlikely to be any significant impact on natural heritage (conditional on the submission of a new biodiversity checklist which was legible).</p>
Ribbon Development	<p>The view is expressed that the ribbon of development begins at No. 36 and ends at No. 36B without a gap site - No. 38 is not visually linked to these properties - does a gap site therefore exist if No. 38 does not share a common frontage or is visually linked to the other dwellings. Is the gap site already filled by the buildings erected in the field behind</p> <p>Policy CTY8 has no requirement for buildings along the road frontage to be visual linked. The buildings must be along a road frontage. It has been accepted that the dwellings from Nos. 36 - 38 have frontages to the road. A gap is located between buildings on the road frontage. The buildings erected to the rear do not occupy the gap in this application.</p>
Environmental Health have raised the issue of a suitable surface water solution.	Environmental Health stated they had no objections, with further details to be provided at the subsequent reserved matters application. This is a quite standard response on outline applications of this nature.
Impact on Existing Vegetation and impact on Privacy	The view is expressed that existing vegetation is likely to be cleared - ask the developers to plant trees/visual screens to maintain privacy.

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

Week Ending 22 January 2021

	The application is recommended for refusal so no planting conditions are necessary.
Impact on existing internet services	<p>Concern is expressed that the development will place an increased load on the internet connection will have further detrimental impact on speeds available in the area and the connection available to new properties would be of a lower standard than expected.</p> <p>How Internet connection and speeds will be affected by additional development in an area is not a planning consideration.</p>
The red line includes 3rd party land either side of the subject field.	The agent was requested to comment on the P2 challenge raised. A response was issued stating that the applicant can fully confirm that the lands with the application site are all under their ownership and a letter to confirm this will follow. At the time of this assessment no subsequent letter had been received.