

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

Week Ending 30 April 2021

Item Number 1			
Application Reference	LA05/2020/1021/F	Date Valid	04.12.2020
Description of Proposal	Two storey extension to rear of existing detached dwelling and alterations(increase in ridge height) to the dwelling and garage	Location	30 Glenhugh Park, Belfast
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
6	N/A	N/A	N/A
Consideration of Objections			
Issue	Consideration of Issue		
Impact on parking and the flow of traffic through Glenhugh Park	<p>Concerns have been raised that the application includes alterations to an existing garage which they state was operating as a private gym prior to covid-19 restrictions. They believe that the alterations are not for domestic purposes and that consideration needs to be given to the impact on residential parking and traffic flow.</p> <p>The application has been submitted on a PHD form for householder development. The proposal is for extension and alterations to an existing domestic residential property and would bring no intensification of use. The existing parking space associated with the property would not be affected by the proposal. DfI Roads have been consulted and have no objections to the development proposal.</p>		
Roof ridge height	<p>Concerns have been raised about the proposed increase in ridge height to the dwelling. It is believed that it is not in scale with adjacent properties and that it would have a negative impact on the character of the area.</p> <p>Through the processing of the application the proposed ridge height has been reduced. The amended proposal involves increasing the ridge height of the dwelling by 0.84 of a metre. The proposed ridge height would match the ridge height of the adjacent property of number 28 and is considered to be acceptable.</p>		

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

Week Ending 30 April 2021

<p>Dormer window to front of property</p>	<p>Concerns have been raised about the introduction of a dormer window into Glenhugh Park.</p> <p>The introduction of a dormer window to the front of the property is considered to be sympathetic and complementary to the existing dwelling and would not have a negative impact on the appearance and character of the established residential area</p>
<p>Overshadowing/loss of light</p>	<p>Concerns have been raised that the proposal would overshadow and cause loss of light to neighbouring properties.</p> <p>The light test has been carried out and it is considered that due to the positioning and design of the proposal that no unacceptable loss of light would occur to neighbouring properties.</p>
<p>Rear extension</p>	<p>Concerns are raised that the proposed rear extension is for two storeys.</p> <p>The proposed rear extension would provide 2 storey accommodation to the rear of the dwelling house. Its design is considered to be acceptable in this context and would not detract from the appearance and character of the area. It is also noted that a precedent has already been set within Glenhugh Park for two storey extensions to the rear with the adjacent property of number 28 having a large two storey extension to the rear.</p>
<p>External finishes</p>	<p>The objectors state that the external finish of a proposal should aim to complement the type of materials, colour and finish of the existing building.</p> <p>It is considered that the proposal external materials would complement the existing material finishes in Glenhugh Park and is acceptable for the site and its location.</p>
<p>Removal of existing wall and fencing</p>	<p>Concerns have been raised about the existing shared boundary between the application site and property number 28 and the impact of the proposal on it.</p> <p>Through the processing of the application amended plans have been submitted with the elements of concern that would potentially affect the shared boundary treatment removed. The garden room has been removed and the part of the proposed garage wall is now set back from the boundary. The proposals on the amended plans removes the impact on the shared boundary treatment.</p>
<p>Adverse environmental impact due to proposed removal/potential</p>	<p>Concerns have been raised that the proposed retaining wall to the garden room would remove/destroy the existing hedge and tree which has been there for over 50 years.</p>

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

Week Ending 30 April 2021

<p>destruction of existing hedge and tree</p>	<p>Through the processing of the application amended plans have been submitted removing the garden room and impact to the existing hedge and tree.</p>
<p>Environmental impact to location of flue</p>	<p>Concerns have been raised about the location of the proposed flue and asks for clarification if it is to facilitate a gas or natural wood burner. There are concerns that there is no way of controlling the burn off fumes and that they would be blown onto the neighbouring property and its impact to air pollution and proximity to the neighbours living and sleeping areas.</p> <p>The proposal is for a gas flue to be located in the properties rear amenity space. Environmental Health have been consulted twice through the processing of the application. They have considered the proposal and taken on board the concerns raised from the objectors. They confirm that the agent has advised that the flue is for a wall mounted gas fire for the patio and Environmental Health have no objection to the proposed development. It is considered that the proposal would not have a negative impact on air pollution or the neighbours' amenity.</p>
<p>Impact to the established character of the neighbourhood</p>	<p>Concerns are raised that the proposal would have a negative impact on the established character of the neighbourhood, and that within Glenhugh Park, extensions have been kept within the original ground floor footprint of the dwelling.</p> <p>It is considered that the amended scheme would not have a negative impact on the established character of the neighbourhood and complies with policy EXT 1 Residential Extensions and Alterations.</p>

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

Week Ending 30 April 2021

Item Number 2			
Application Reference	LA05/2021/0079/O	Date Valid	21.01.2021
Description of Proposal	Replacement dwelling	Location	Land 200m north-east of 43 Ballykine Road Ballynahinch BT24 8JE
Group Recommendation	Refusal	Case Officer	Margaret Manley
Reasons for Recommendation			
<p>The proposal is contrary to the Strategic Planning Policy Statement (SPPS) and Policy CTY1 of Planning Policy Statement 21, Sustainable Development in the Countryside in that there are no overriding reasons why this development is essential in this rural location and could not be located within a settlement.</p> <p>The proposal is contrary to the Strategic Planning Policy Statement (SPPS) and Policies CTY 1 and CTY 3 of Planning Policy Statement 21, Sustainable Development in the Countryside, in that there is no permitted structure that exhibits the essential characteristics of a dwelling.</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 30 April 2021

Item Number 3			
Application Reference	LA05/2020/0836/F	Date Valid	20.10.2020
Description of Proposal	Proposed single storey side extension with internal alterations and retrospective planning for single storey rear extension and amended window openings to first floor extension approved under LA05/2016/0393/F	Location	61 Magheralave Road Lisburn
Group Recommendation	Approval	Case Officer	Sinead McCloskey
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		
The extension is very close to the proximity to the fence and property boundary - when measuring it using the online measurement tool it ranges from 45cm - 85cm	The proposed extension ranges from 0.45m at the closest point to the boundary to 1.1m. The existing extension to the rear (that applied for retrospectively) is 1.6m to the closest part of the boundary. The site levels are lower than the properties to the rear in Magheralave Manor. Approximately 3m of the proposed extension is located directly to the rear of No. 14 Magheralave Manor. The proposed new extension is 2.6m in height at this point. This as well as the difference in levels will result in no adverse effects to the adjacent property. The extension to the rear is set back further from this boundary at 1.6m. It has a flat roof. The difference in levels and the size of this extension will not result in any adverse effects on any neighbouring properties.		
The application does not define boundaries yet seems close to neighbouring boundaries.	The site boundaries are defined on the plans. No boundary treatments are shown. The applicant is in full ownership of the hedge and can remove at any stage without planning permission. The hedge is not needed to assist with the proposed development to prevent any adverse effects. Any removal of a common boundary requires neighbouring consent.		

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

Week Ending 30 April 2021

<p>Impact on Boundary Hedges</p>	<p>Concern is expressed that the extension will interfere with the hedge that runs between the neighbouring property and the dwelling. The hedge is 60cm in depth - how is it possible to maintain a hedgeline at such narrow points, and how the hedge could be maintained given there will be restricted access to do so.</p> <p>The hedge is in the applicant's ownership and can be removed at any stage without planning permission. It is not required to be retained as part of this application.</p>
<p>General Principles</p>	<p>The view is expressed that according to general principles the extension should be 1m from the recorded boundary (A diagram taken from 'Your Home and Planning Permission is included, taken from page 5, Section 1: Building an Extension).</p> <p>The general principles referred too would appear to be taken from the document 'Your home and Planning Permission'. This document refers to development that can be undertaken without planning permission, ie. permitted development. The development proposed within this application is requesting planning permission, and is not relying on permitted development regulations.</p>
<p>Retrospective Nature</p>	<p>The view is expressed that the application should also include a retrospective application for the additional extension previously outlined in the plans.</p> <p>After a site inspection and history search, the applicant was requested to include the extension to rear as part of this application. An amended description was submitted and was re-neighbour notified.</p>