

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

**Week Ending 1 May 2020**

<b>Item Number 1</b>			
<b>Application Reference</b>	LA05/2017/0525/F	<b>Date Valid</b>	23 May 2017
<b>Description of Proposal</b>	Erection of housing development comprising of 19 dwellings consisting of 3 no. 2 storey detached dwellings and 16 no. 2 storey semi-detached dwellings including new vehicular access from Gobraña Road and all associated site works and landscaping.	<b>Location</b>	Lands between nos. 11 Crumlin Road and 7 Gobraña Road Glenavy Crumlin
<b>Group Recommendation</b>	Approval	<b>Case Officer</b>	Grainne Rice
<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>
8	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>Consideration of Objections</b>			
<b>Issue</b>	<b>Consideration of Issue</b>		
Loss of privacy and sunlight.	The separation distances and orientation of the proposed dwellings would ensure that the design and layout will not conflict with adjacent land uses and there is no unacceptable adverse effect on existing or proposed properties in terms of overlooking, loss of light or overshadowing. Comprehensive landscaping has also been provided which will provide additional screening detailing all existing vegetation to be retained were possible and additional planting throughout the development.		
Lack of infrastructure and insufficient sewage facilities.	NI Water, DfI Roads, NIEA Water Management Unit and Environmental Health have all been consulted on the application and have confirmed there is available capacity to serve the necessary infrastructure and sewage facilities subject to necessary conditions and informatives. Therefore, it is not considered that lack of infrastructure and insufficient sewage facilities is an issue within the site.		
Increase in anti-social behaviour.	Development of the site would result in a planning gain as it has been unused for some years. Anti-social behaviour in the locality should be reported to the PSNI.		

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

**Week Ending 1 May 2020**

Flood Risk from Glenavy River.	Dfi Rivers were consulted on the application and accept the logic as set out in the drainage assessment and associated information. There would be a 5m wide working maintenance strip to be preserved adjacent to the existing watercourse. Dfi Rivers have no objections to the proposed development from a drainage or flood risk perspective.
Contaminated land on the site, potential for pollution.	Environmental Health and NIEA Land Soil and Air have reviewed the generic quantitative risk assessment (GQRA) and have no objections subject to conditions. Appropriate conditions will be applied to any decision notice to ensure that risks from land contamination to the future users of the land and neighbouring land are minimised and to ensure that the development can be carried out safely without unacceptable risks to workers, neighbours and other offsite receptors.
Infestation of Japanese knotweed.	A Japanese Knotweed (JKW) Options Appraisal was carried out. A full detailed invasive species management plan is required before any works commence onsite. An appropriate planning condition will be applied to any potential decision notice. NIEA Natural Environment Division have been consulted and have no objections subject to appropriate conditions.
Road safety.	DfI Roads offer no objection to the development proposal subject to appropriate conditions and informatives. The proposal is policy compliant with PPS 3 Access Movement and Parking. The use of No. 11 Crumlin Road as it is an end terrace of the row of houses. The agent confirmed it is proposed to retain No. 11 Crumlin Road, the site plan and location map reflect this.

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

**Week Ending 1 May 2020**

<b>Item Number 2</b>			
<b>Application Reference</b>	LA05/20171265/F	<b>Date Valid</b>	11 December 2017
<b>Description of Proposal</b>	Retrospective change of use of existing disused outbuilding to create 5 no. let-able one and two bedroom holiday cottages. Proposal to incorporate new vehicular entrance and parking area for proposed cottages and serving existing farm dwelling (Amended proposal description, address and supporting information)	<b>Location</b>	Site adjacent to 18 Aghnatrisk Road Culcavy
<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 proposal is contrary to the SPPS and Policy TSM 5 of PPS 16 Tourism in that the proposed units are not located within the grounds of an existing or approved hotel, self-catering complex, guest house or holiday park, nor does it entail the restoration/replacement of an existing clachan or close.</p> <p>The proposal is contrary to the SPPS and Policy TSM 7 of PPS16 Tourism in that it has not been demonstrated that the development if permitted would not detract from the landscape quality and character of this rural area.</p>			
<b>Representations</b>			
<b>Objection Letters</b>	<b>Support Letters</b>	<b>Objection Petitions</b>	<b>Support Petitions</b>
	N/A	N/A	N/A
<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 1 May 2020**

<b>Item Number 3</b>			
<b>Application Reference</b>	LA05/2020/0113/O	<b>Date Valid</b>	06 February 2020
<b>Description of Proposal</b>	Two no infill dwellings	<b>Location</b>	Between 104 & 108 Belfast Road Saintfield BT24 7HF
<b>Group Recommendation</b>	Refusal	<b>Case Officer</b>	Brenda Ferguson
<b>Reasons for Recommendation</b>			
<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 that 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 PPS 3, Access, Movement and Parking, Policy AMP 3, in that it would, if permitted, result in the creation of a new access onto a Protected Route, thereby prejudicing the free flow of traffic and conditions of general safety.</p> <p>The proposal is contrary to the SPPS and Policy CTY 8 of PPS 21 Sustainable Development in the Countryside in that it does not constitute a gap site within an otherwise substantial and continuously built up frontage and it would add to a ribbon of development along the Belfast Road.</p> <p>The proposal is contrary to Policy CTY 14 of PPS 21 Sustainable Development in the Countryside in that the development would, if permitted, add to an existing ribbon of development along the Belfast Road, further eroding the character of the area.</p>			
<b>Representations</b>			
<b>Objection Letters</b>	<b>Support Letters</b>	<b>Objection Petitions</b>	<b>Support Petitions</b>
Two	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>Consideration of Objections</b>			
<b>Issue</b>	<b>Consideration of Issue</b>		
No substantial and built up frontage as no continuous line of houses	The assessment demonstrates that there is no gap site within a continuous and built up frontage.		
Site constitutes visual break and development of 2	The assessment demonstrates that the development of the site would detract from the character and further erode the countryside by adding to an existing ribbon of development		

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

**Week Ending 1 May 2020**

houses would detract from rural charm and character	
Traffic concerns as accidents on bend.	The proposed development intends to create a new access onto a protected route which is unacceptable in terms of traffic flow and general safety.
Applicant's intention to sell site	The permission relates to the land itself and ownership is a legal matter and intentions with regard to future sales sits outside the remit of planning.
Impact on value of own property	No substantive evidence is provided in relation to the concern expressed in this regard. The impact on the value of property is not given weight in the assessment.

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

**Week Ending 1 May 2020**

Item Number 4			
<b>Application Reference</b>	LA05/2017/0772/F	<b>Date Valid</b>	21 July 2017
<b>Description of Proposal</b>	Proposed retention of replacement agricultural building (marked A) and proposed agricultural quarantine building (marked B) and retention of all hardstanding.	<b>Location</b>	To the rear of 36, 36A and 38 Halftown Road and 320m north west of 32 Halftown Road, Lisburn.
<b>Group Recommendation</b>	Refusal	<b>Case Officer</b>	Richard McMullan
Reasons for Recommendation			
<p>The proposal is contrary to the SPPS and Policy CTY 1 and CTY12 of Planning Policy Statement 21, Sustainable Development in the Countryside in that it has not been demonstrated that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ the development (building A) is located within a currently active and established farm holding.</li> <li>▪ it is necessary for the efficient use of the active and established agricultural (or forestry) holding;</li> <li>▪ it is appropriate to this location due to its unacceptable character and scale;</li> <li>▪ the development, if permitted would not have an adverse impact on natural heritage features;</li> <li>▪ the development, if permitted, would not result in a detrimental impact on the amenity of residential dwellings outside the holding or enterprise by reason of noise/ smell /pests.</li> <li>▪ there are no suitable existing buildings on the holding or enterprise that can be used</li> <li>▪ the design and materials to be used are sympathetic to the locality and adjacent buildings</li> <li>▪ the proposal is sited beside existing farm or forestry buildings</li> <li>▪ there are no alternative sites available at another group of buildings on the holding and that health and safety reasons exist to justify an alternative site away from the existing farm (or forestry) buildings or that the alternative site away is essential for the efficient functioning of the business.</li> </ul>			

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

**Week Ending 1 May 2020**

The proposal is contrary to the SPPS and Policy CTY13 of Planning Policy Statement 21, Sustainable Development in the Countryside, in that the design of proposed building (a) is inappropriate for the site and its locality.

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, it would if permitted not respect the traditional pattern of settlement exhibited in the area and would therefore result in a detrimental change to (further erode) the rural character of the countryside.

The proposal is contrary to the SPPS and Planning Policy Statement 2, Planning and Nature Conservation Policy NH2 in that it has not been demonstrated that the development will not harm species protected by law.

The proposal is contrary to the SPPS and Planning Policy Statement 15, Planning and Flood Risk, policy FLD1 in that the site falls within the 1 in 100 year fluvial flood plain and it has not been demonstrated that the development meets the exceptions test for developments in flood plains.

**Representations**

Objection Letters	Support Letters	Objection Petitions	Support Petitions
None	N/A	N/A	N/A

**Consideration of Objections**

Issue	Consideration of Issue