

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

**Week Ending 26 June 2020**

<b>Item Number 1</b>			
<b>Application Reference</b>	LA05/2018/0862/F	<b>Date Valid</b>	15.08.2018
<b>Description of Proposal</b>	Proposed infill site for 2 no dwellings with detached garages.	<b>Location</b>	Between 26 & 30 Magheraconluce Road Hillsborough
<b>Group Recommendation</b>	Refusal	<b>Case Officer</b>	Catherine Gray
<b>Reasons for Recommendation</b>			
<p>The proposal is contrary to the SPPS and Policies CTY 1 and CTY 8 of Planning Policy Statement 21, Sustainable Development in the Countryside, in that the proposal, if permitted, would not respect the existing development pattern along the frontage in terms of size and scale.</p> <p>The proposal is contrary to the SPPS and Policy CTY13 of Planning Policy Statement 21, Sustainable Development in the Countryside, in that the proposal would, if permitted, be a prominent feature in the landscape; the ancillary works would not integrate with their surroundings; the design of the proposal is inappropriate for the site and its locality and the proposal fails to blend with the landform and therefore would not visually integrate into the surrounding landscape.</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 proposal would, if permitted, be unduly prominent in the landscape and the impact of ancillary works would damage rural character.</p> <p>The proposal is contrary to the SPPS and 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 visibility splays of 2.4 metres x 87 metres from the proposed access cannot be provided in accordance with the standards contained in the Department's Development Control Advice Note 15.</p> <p>The proposal is contrary to the SPPS and 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 adequate forward sight distance of 87 metres is not available, on the public road, at the proposed access in accordance with the standards contained in the Department's Development Control Advice Note 15.</p>			
<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>		
Planning permission was	The planning history is taken into consideration through the processing of the application.		

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

**Week Ending 26 June 2020**

refused previously in 1987/88	
The proposal is not an infill.	The proposal has been assessed against policy CTY 8 Ribbon Development and is considered to meet the exception as set out in the policy.
Could set a precedent	Each planning application is assessed on its own merits.
Prominence.	It is agreed that the proposal if permitted would be a prominent feature in the landscape and is contrary to policies CTY 13 and 14 of PPS 21.
Traffic impact and road safety.	The required visibility splays cannot be achieved and a fully dimensioned engineering drawing clearly showing visibility splays and forward sight lines properly dimensions and accurate as required by DfI Roads has not been provided, as it is clearly obvious that these are unattainable. Response: DfI Roads have been consulted and considers the application unacceptable as submitted. The proposal is contrary to Planning Policy Statement 3 Access, Movement and Parking.
Consultation dates are excessively short.	Representation can be made on any planning application up until a decision is made.
Landownership issues	The red line of an application site can be extended for access purposes only and land ownership is a legal matter.

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

**Week Ending 26 June 2020**

<b>Item Number 2</b>			
<b>Application Reference</b>	LA05/2019/0943/F	<b>Date Valid</b>	17.09.2019
<b>Description of Proposal</b>	Amendments to existing approved dwelling under planning application LA05/2015/0917/F	<b>Location</b>	122 Saintfield Road Lisburn
<b>Group Recommendation</b>	Approval	<b>Case Officer</b>	Joseph Billham
<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>		
Impact on site lines.	DFI Roads have been consulted on the application regarding the impact of the development on site lines and offered no objections.		
Replacement is closer to the junction than the original house.	It is considered the new position of the dwelling will not have a detrimental impact on the character of the surrounding area. The new position of the dwelling has been consulted by DFI Roads and have no objections.		
Erection of a fence block site lines of the junction.	The fence has now been removed and a landscape plan submitted. DFI Roads have been consulted in relation to the landscaping plan the impact on site lines and offered no objections.		

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

**Week Ending 26 June 2020**

<b>Item Number 3</b>			
<b>Application Reference</b>	LA05/2019/1316/F	<b>Date Valid</b>	27.12.2019
<b>Description of Proposal</b>	Removal of condition 2 on the planning permission (S/2010/0028/F) which states 'the buildings hereby permitted shall be used only as holiday accommodation and shall not be for permanent residence'	<b>Location</b>	1, 2, 3 Drumlin Lane Hillsborough
<b>Group Recommendation</b>	Refusal	<b>Case Officer</b>	Grainne Rice
<b>Reasons for Recommendation</b>			
<p>The proposal is contrary to the SPPS and Policy CTY 1 of PPS 21 in that there are no overriding reasons why the development is essential and could not be located in a settlement, or is it otherwise allocated for development in a development plan.</p> <p>The proposed development is contrary to the SPPS and Policy QD 1 (a) (c) and (f) of Planning Policy Statement 7: Quality Residential Environments, in that the development does not respect the surrounding context in terms of density and layout and is inappropriate to the character of the area and it has not been demonstrated that</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- adequate provision is made for private open space,</li> <li>- nor has appropriate provision been made for parking.</li> </ul>			
<b>Representations</b>			
<b>Objection Letters</b>	<b>Support Letters</b>	<b>Objection Petitions</b>	<b>Support Petitions</b>
<b>0</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>N/A</b>
<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 26 June 2020**

<b>Item Number 4</b>			
<b>Application Reference</b>	LA05/2018/1102/F	<b>Date Valid</b>	30.10.2018
<b>Description of Proposal</b>	Proposed construction of 8 no dwellings 6no garages with associated parking and landscaping.	<b>Location</b>	Lands at Derriaghy Road (south west of 5 Haddington Hill and north of 13 Haddington Hill) Lisburn
<b>Group Recommendation</b>	Approval	<b>Case Officer</b>	Rachel Taylor
<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>
<b>8</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>N/A</b>
<b>Consideration of Objections</b>			
<b>Issue</b>	<b>Consideration of Issue</b>		
Tree removal pre application.	The site was cleared prior to submission of the application as confirmed by the Bio Diversity Checklist submitted. The vegetation was not protected under a Tree Preservation Order.		
Wildlife corridor.	A Bio Diversity Checklist was submitted with the application confirming that the clearance works had taken pace prior to submission of the planning application. Natural Environment Division were consulted and have no natural heritage concerns.		
Loss of privacy.	The proposed layout has been amended and reduced by one dwelling to ensure the spacing between properties is adequate to avoid overlooking. The sites with the closest relationship have been moved away from the common boundary, and designed including proposed intervening dense vegetation, to be conditioned to ensure privacy is maintained between the properties. The proposed dwellings closest to existing properties have also been designed with no upper floor windows to overlook. The only upper floor windows are opaque.		
Loss of sunlight.	The separation distances have been carefully considered within the amended scheme and there should be no loss of sunlight to adjacent properties.		
Substantive landscaping required to replace that removed.	Full details of proposed landscaping has been requested and submitted and will form part of the stamped drawings, and be reinforced by condition.		

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

**Week Ending 26 June 2020**

Culvert proposed – like rivers agency comment in relation to same.	Rivers Agency have been fully consulted on all aspects of the application and are content with the proposals.
Would like their property identified on the plans.	Several iterations of the plans have been received and neighbour notified. The plans are sufficient to identify the neighbouring properties.
Increased traffic.	The site was already previously developed and had its own access. DfI Roads have carried out a number of consultations in relation to the application and its revisions and are content that the existing access and internal layout can be upgraded to private streets determination standards with visibility splays to be provided of 45m x 160m on each side.
No right hand turning lane proposed.	The application does not exceed the threshold to require a right hand turning lane.
Proximity to Boomers Reservoir.	Rivers Agency have confirmed that DfI River's reservoir inundation maps indicate that this site is in a potential area of inundation emanating from Boomers Reservoir. DfI Rivers is in possession of information confirming that Boomers Reservoir has 'Responsible Reservoir Manager Status'. Consequently DfI Rivers has no reason to object to the proposal from a reservoir flood risk perspective. The proposal is therefore found to be compliant with all aspects of PPS15.
Level differences cause overlooking.	A number of amended drawings have been requested which included the reduction in numbers and the detailing of panting and submission of cross sections to ensure that there was no detrimental impact on the neighbouring properties given the level difference. It is noted that no further objections were received further to notification of the final set of amended drawings.
Former water service treatment plant and Pre Application Discussion (PAD) not mentioned.	There is no pre requisite to mention the former use. This was fully explored by the submission of an Environmental Site Assessment report, a Generic Quantitative Risk Assessment (GQRA) and exploratory hole records in support of the application. These have been verified by NIEA Land, Soil and Air and are accepted subject to condition. Any PAD would be noted in the planning history of the site.
Flood risk.	Rivers Agency have confirmed that the site is not located in the flood plain. A full drainage assessment has been submitted and agreed with Rivers Agency ensuring greenfield runoff rate for the development. As above the site is located within the reservoir inundation zones for Boomers Reservoir however Rivers Agency have confirmed that they are in possession of information confirming that Boomers Reservoir has 'Responsible Reservoir Manager Status'. Consequently DfI Rivers has no reason to object to the proposal from a reservoir flood risk perspective.

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

**Week Ending 26 June 2020**

	The proposal is therefore found to be compliant with all aspects of PPS15.
No Traffic Impact Assessment.	There has been detailed consultation with DFI Roads in relation to the application and they are content. The application was not of sufficient size to require a Traffic Impact Assessment.