

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

Week Ending 31st January 2020

Item Number 1			
Application Reference	LA05/2019/0542/F	Date Valid	22.05.2019
Description of Proposal	Partial demolition of existing courtyard boundary walls, secondary entrance gates and external oil and bin store. Proposed rear 3 storey extension and associated alterations and repairs.	Location	9 Main Street Hillsborough
Group Recommendation	Approval	Case Officer	Grainne Rice
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		
Potential for shared entrance to be blocked vehicles during construction.	Dfi Roads were consulted on the planning application and have no objections subject to a condition and informatives. It has been demonstrated that cars can enter and leave the site in a safe manner and that there is adequate car parking to the rear of the site.		
Proposed extension is not in keeping and would impact on the established character of the area.	The proposed site is located within conservation area of Hillsborough and No. 9 Main Street is a Grade B1 listed building. NIEA HED and the Conservation Area Officer were consulted on the planning application and have no objections subject to conditions. The scale and nature of the development proposal is satisfactory to SPPS and PPS 6 archaeological policy requirements. There is an associated Listed Building Consent application LA05/2019/0541/LB under consideration with this application.		
Associated noise and disturbance.	Noise and general disturbance caused by construction are not dealt with under planning legislation and is a matter for the local Environmental Health Office. Environmental Health have been consulted on the application and have no objections.		
The proposed extension would	A drawing was submitted showing the position of the neighbouring windows at No. 11 Main Street with the angle test demonstrating no loss of light or overshadowing.		



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

Week Ending 31st January 2020

result in a loss of light.	
----------------------------	--

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

Week Ending 31st January 2020

Item Number 2			
Application Reference	LA05/2019/0954/RM	Date Valid	19.09.2019
Description of Proposal	1 Private Dwelling	Location	Lands between 6 & 8 Whinney Hill 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		
Drivers speed on laneway and Council should upgrade the lane.	DFI Roads were consulted on the application and have advised that they are content with the proposal and had no further objections. They made no stipulations that the laneway should be upgraded.		

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

Week Ending 31st January 2020

Item Number 3			
Application Reference	LA05/2019/1141/F	Date Valid	07.11.2019
Description of Proposal	Proposed additional unit on flat roof terrace area to existing approved apartment block E under planning approval LA05/2018/1257/F with minor alterations to elevations and additional parking for same	Location	The Rose Garden Queensway Derriaghy
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
8	N/A	N/A	N/A
Consideration of Objections			
Issue	Consideration of Issue		
Parking provision.	The current and approved access to the site is proposed to be used and a revised layout includes an additional 2 parking spaces to serve the proposal. The existing approved site layout demonstrates 47 car parking spaces for 31no. 2 bed apartments. This proposal indicates a total of 49 car parking spaces for 32no. 2 bed apartments. The proposal complies with Parking Standards. DfI Roads have been consulted and have no objections.		
Provision of existing parking for apartment block is not currently sufficient, and will result in overspill into adjacent properties.	The apartment block has been built without the parking provision being completed as yet. It is the developer's responsibility to ensure that the development is completed in full. Unauthorised parking is a matter for the Roads enforcement.		
Original plans not correct.	Any inaccuracies on the original submission has been addressed through the subsequent applications and the plans on this proposal are considered to be accurate.		



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

Week Ending 31st January 2020

Not enough provision for bin storage.	Environmental Health have been consulted on the application and have no objections. The proposed bin storage area has been marked on the submitted drawing.
---------------------------------------	---

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

Week Ending 31st January 2020

Item Number 4			
Application Reference	LA05/2019/1051/F	Date Valid	15.10.2019
Description of Proposal	2 storey private residential detached dwelling with detached garage with storage provided to first floor over garage.	Location	Site adjacent to no 27 Knockbracken Road Carryduff
Group Recommendation	Refusal	Case Officer	Richard McMullan
Reasons for Recommendation			
<p>The proposal is contrary to the 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 SPPS and Policy CTY2a of Planning Policy Statement 21, New Dwellings in Existing Clusters in that the proposed dwelling is not located within an existing cluster of development consisting of 4 or more buildings of which at least three are dwellings, the cluster does not appear as a visual entity in the local landscape, the cluster is not associated with a focal point, the proposed site is not bounded on at least two sides with other development in the cluster and does not provide a suitable degree of enclosure and the dwelling would if permitted visually intrude into the open countryside.</p> <p>The proposal is contrary to the SPPS and Policy CTY8 of Planning Policy Statement 21, Sustainable Development in the Countryside in that the proposal would, if permitted, result in the addition of ribbon development along the Knockbracken Road.</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 proposed site is unable to provide a suitable degree of enclosure for the building to integrate into the landscape, the proposed development relies primarily on the use of new landscaping for integration and the proposed building fails to blend with the landform, existing trees, buildings, slopes and other natural features which provide a backdrop.</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, the development would, if permitted add to a ribbon of development along the Knockbracken road and would therefore result in a detrimental change to/further erode the rural character of the countryside.</p> <p>The proposal is contrary to the SPPS and Policy CTY15 of Planning Policy Statement 21, Sustainable Development in the Countryside in that the development would if permitted mar the distinction between the defined settlement limit of Metropolitan Castlereagh and the surrounding countryside.</p>			

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

Week Ending 31st January 2020

Representations			
Objection Letters	Support Letters	Objection Petitions	Support Petitions
2	N/A	N/A	N/A
Consideration of Objections			
Issue	Consideration of Issue		
Site within rural landscape wedge.	Significant material weight is not given to Policy COU 2 of draft BMAP as it was augmented in the PAC report after the public enquiry.		
Not in keeping with PPS 21 policy CTY2a.	Following a full assessment against PPS 21 CTY2a it is considered that the proposal fails this policy and is considered not to be an acceptable development.		
Visual impact.	It is considered that the application would have a detrimental visual impact by virtue of the sub-urban build-up of development and the marring of the distinction between the defined settlement of Metropolitan Castlereagh and the countryside to the south.		
Two different policy contexts (site within rural area but dwellings to the north within urban area).	The differentiation between policy context in rural and urban is acknowledged. The site is located within the rural area and a number of dwellings to the north are within the defined settlement limits of Metropolitan Castlereagh. As a consequence, the application is considered not to represent an acceptable cluster development as per the requirements of policy CTY2a.		
Site not visually connected to focal point.	It is considered that the application site does not fall within a cluster of development. In turn it is considered that it is not connected to a focal point as a consequence of this.		
Obstruction of private views.	This issue would not be given determining weight in this instance.		
Pollution of land.	There are no issues with regards to pollution. NI Water have been consulted and forwarded no objections. The proposal seeks connection to the mains sewerage system, therefore no septic tank is proposed.		
Disturbance of local wildlife.	It is considered that the development will not have any impacts on local wildlife.		