

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

Week Ending 26th January 2024

Item Number 1			
Application Reference	LA05/2022/1041/F	Date Valid	04.11.2022
Description of Proposal	Proposed 2 storey sports pavilion consisting of storage, office and changing/showers on ground floor with gallery and external viewing area at first floor	Location	Adjacent to 33 Lisnagarvey Drive, Lisburn
Group Recommendation	Approval	Case Officer	Barbara Hanna
Reasons for Recommendation			
All relevant planning material considerations have been satisfied.			
Representations			
Objection Letters	Support Letters	Objection Petitions	Support Petitions
11	N/A	N/A	N/A
Consideration of Objections			
Issue	Consideration of Issue		
Design and visual amenity – dominant/out of character.	The proposal is a similar height to the surrounding buildings. The proposal is 7.9m at the tallest point, No's 31 and 33 Lisnagarvey Drive are 7.5m high. Properties in Thompson Manor occupy an elevated site and No.48 is 2.04m higher than then the proposal. The gable of the building faces onto Lisnagarvey Drive and does not dominate the street scene. The proposed finishes are in keeping with the finish of houses along Lisnagarvey Drive and not considered to be out of character.		
Overlooking/loss of privacy.	The South east elevation facing No.33 includes a door at ground floor level and 3 first floor windows serving a toilet and the gallery/servery. The toilet window is fitted with obscure glass and the 2 gallery windows are high level windows with obscure glass. Consequently, there are no overlooking concerns in relation to these windows. There is a portion of the balcony to the side of this elevation with an external stairwell adjacent. A 2m high timber screen is attached to the balcony facing No.33 to prevent any overlooking of the private amenity space to the rear of No's 33 and 35. There will be intermittent views across the garden from the top of the stairwell; however, at this point there is a 13m separating distance to the boundary fence which is deemed acceptable. The south west elevation facing the rear garden of No.31 has a ground floor window and first floor window serving the internal stairwell and landing. These windows are located 14.6m from the boundary with		

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

Week Ending 26th January 2024

	No.31, this is an adequate separation distance to prevent any unacceptable overlooking.
Noise and disturbance.	<p>It is envisaged that anyone spectating would primarily stand along the north west elevation for the purpose of watching a match. The agent has advised that the first floor gallery is an area for a small number of spectators especially those who are disabled to view the matches from inside during inclement weather and a small outside viewing area to be used during better weather. The inside and outside galleries will only be used on a Saturdays. Spectators already attend the site; it is not anticipated that the noise will be any greater than what presently exists as there are no additional pitches being created and the facility is not creating additional traffic.</p> <p>Environmental Health were consulted on the application and advised that they have no objection subject to condition. It is therefore concluded that the proposal will not result in an unacceptable level of noise nor antisocial behaviour.</p>
Potential external lighting and CCTV.	There is no reference to proposed external lighting or CCTV cameras within the submitted plans or application form, so this does not form part of the assessment.
Loss of mature trees and vegetation.	<p>The existing trees and boundary hedge along the south west boundary are to be retained or replanted where required. Most of the existing trees and hedging is to be removed along the north west and north east boundary to facilitate a clearer view across the pitches for spectators. The loss has been partially compensated by including new planting along the boundary fence with No.33.</p> <p>NIEA Natural Environment Map View confirms that the site is not located within a Protect Area and there are no known Priority Habitats or Priority Species.</p>
Traffic generation/Lack of parking/Danger for pedestrians.	<p>The development proposal will only be used by the existing students and staff as disclosed in Qu.25 of the P1 Form. There are no proposed changes to the existing access arrangements or parking provision within the site. There is an existing car park within the Wallace High School grounds which can be used for parking. DFI roads have offered no objection to the proposed development subject to the car parking being open for use at all times during all hours of operation.</p> <p>It is not envisaged that the proposal will cause danger for pedestrians. The lands area surrounding the pavilion is already used for sporting purposes. The proposal is to provide changing facilities and a viewing area for existing spectators.</p>
No vehicular or pedestrian access via Lisnagarvey Drive.	Submitted plans demonstrate that there is no intention to directly access the site off Lisnagarvey Drive. It is proposed to erect a 2m high fence across the site frontage onto Lisnagarvey Drive. The pedestrian access between No.36 and No.38 already exists to serve the school.

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

Week Ending 26th January 2024

Flood risk and drainage concerns.	The proposal will increase the amount of hardstanding. However, there will be some grass remaining and additional planting along the boundary with No.33 should help. The site is not identified on the Flood Maps (NI) as an area susceptible to flooding and does not exceed the threshold for a drainage assessment.
Concern regarding users of pavilion – school only or outsiders.	The agent has indicated that the servery is to provide tea, coffee and soft drinks to spectators using the viewing area especially during poor weather. There is no indication that the premises are to be used for entertainment purposes. Environmental Health has reminded applicant that if they intend to have entertainment at the premises, they are required to apply for an entertainment licence.
Concern regarding hours of operation.	Objector has stated that school website indicates accessible during evening, weekends and school holiday periods. Environmental Health have not recommended any restrictions to the hours of operation.
Environmental concerns – fumes from cars, bins and vermin.	Environmental Health were consulted and offered no objections to the proposal. There is no proposed vehicular access onto Lisnagarvey Drive to attract cars but there is an existing pedestrian access to entice drop offs. It is envisaged that the number of people visiting the site will remain unchanged so there should be no greater negative environmental impacts.
Loss of light due to height of building.	The new building is positioned to the north of No.33, north east of No.31 and north west of No.48 so given the orientation of the sun there are no concerns regarding overshadowing or loss of light. The proposal is a similar height to surrounding properties in Lisnagarvey Drive and Thompson Manor.

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

Week Ending 26th January 2024

Item Number 2			
Application Reference	LA05/2022/0691/F	Date Valid	20.07.2022
Description of Proposal	Application is for the retention of a sand school (established in 2017) for a family involved in horse breeding. Retention to include flood lights and existing access from Mealough Road for horses	Location	90 meters to the North of 125 Upper Mealough Road, Carryduff
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
7	N/A	N/A	N/A
Consideration of Objections			
Issue	Consideration of Issue		
Incorrect address provided.	The address has been amended accordingly.		
Hedgehogs and badgers frequent the land at 125 and 131 – yet ‘no’ has been selected in point 14 of the P1 Form.	A biodiversity checklist with a supporting ecological statement was submitted and sent to NED for consultation. They responded stating that they had no natural heritage concerns.		
Applicant informed me previously that he had a relative in the planning department.	The section of the P1 form has not declared any relationship. The case officer is unaware of any relative of the applicant working in the Planning Department.		
Ownership challenge	The objector does not claim ownership of any lands within the site, therefore a P2 challenge is not necessary. Certificate A has been completed that the applicant is satisfied that they own or control all of the land within the application site. Permission goes with the land and does not confer title therefore any ownership issue would be a civil matter.		

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

Week Ending 26th January 2024

No. 131 Upper is not included in the Neighbour Notification list.	A neighbour notification letter was sent to No. 131 Upper Mealough Road on the 5 th August 2022.
Point 12 of the P1 Form has been incorrectly selected – there is no existing lawful/vehicular access. None of the options for vehicular use, pedestrian use or both have been selected. Construction of a new access to a public road should have been selected on the P1 Form.	This is a retrospective application, and the access is existing. Question 12 does not question if the access is lawful. DFI Roads have been extensively consulted and are aware of the current site conditions and what the proposal relates to and are content.
The access to the field from the main road was substantially widened without planning permission.	This is a retrospective application and all works carried out form part of the assessment of this application.
Queried the accuracy of the drawings and the inclusion of surrounding buildings.	Following a site inspection all surrounding dwellings and buildings are noted and all access points relevant to this application are shown on the plans.
Point 11 of the P1 does not include any reference to the additional current application LA05/20022/0567/F nor does it indicate how the required Vehicular Access Standards can be achieved.	Planning application LA05/2022/0567/F was withdrawn on the 10 th January 2023.
Safety concerns regarding the current sub-standard access arrangements, and the efficient use of the	Extensive consultation has taken place with DFI who have stated in a final consultation that they have no objections to the proposal subject to conditions.

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

Week Ending 26th January 2024

public road network and conflict with AMP2.	
There is no reason why this sub-standard access is essential in this rural location, as safer access for movement to and from the sand school could have been accommodated via 125 and 123 Upper Mealough Road.	The details presented in the application do not relate to any other access or movement patterns, therefore the authority can only assess the proposals as presented.
Two proposals are under consideration which propose to increase the number of accesses over a short stretch of road, without the benefit of the required distance of visibility.	Extensive consultation has taken place with DFI who have stated in a final consultation that they have no objections to the proposal subject to conditions. The second proposal for the infill dwelling has been withdrawn.
The operation of the sand school appears to rely on the use of a total of three accesses directly off a narrow stretch of country road, over which a further two accesses are travelled across.	Extensive consultation has taken place with DFI who have stated in a final consultation that they have no objections to the proposal subject to conditions.
There is no evidence of a ramp and while it may state that it is not suitable for cars, this access is clearly adequate to allow vehicles to use the access.	It can be assumed that the agent is referring to the sloping ground leading to the sand school from the access as the ramp. A condition provided by Roads states that the access is for pedestrian and horse used only, and not for vehicular use. Any vehicle that will use this access will be in breach of this condition.
Clear dimensioned drawings are needed.	All drawings requested by Roads and the Planning Authority have been provided. Details provided in these are sufficient for the purposes of this assessment.
The proposal to retain the existing access arrangements for the sand school, without	Extensive consultation has taken place with DFI who have stated in a final consultation that they have no objections to the proposal subject to conditions. Sightlines of 2.4 x 70. LHS and 2.4 x 65m RHS are shown and found to be acceptable.

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

Week Ending 26th January 2024

the provision of the required forward sight lines and visibility splays, falls short of the guidance.	
The suitability of emergency service access for the sand school is not addressed.	Extensive consultation has taken place with DFI who have stated in a final consultation that they have no objections to the proposal subject to conditions.
Large, slower vehicles pose additional road safety issues along the application site. Traffic volume will increase on the Upper Mealough Road with works taking place on the Mealough Road.	Extensive consultation has taken place with DFI who have stated in a final consultation that they have no objections to the proposal subject to conditions.
A number of road safety concerns have been highlighted regarding backing up traffic, accidents and a blind curve	Extensive consultation has taken place with DFI who have stated in a final consultation that they have no objections to the proposal subject to conditions and that they have considered the points raised by the objector in detail.
The beech hedge running roadside along the garden of 123 Upper Mealough Road creates a visual obstruction when approaching the entrance to the sand school.	Extensive consultation has taken place with DFI who have stated in a final consultation that they have no objections to the proposal subject to conditions. Adequate visibility splays have been demonstrated and will have to be kept clear.
It is unclear where the warning signs are to be erected, there is no place to accommodate a sign, it would not be visible to traffic and if might prejudice road safety.	Two road signs are located on drawing No. 03/1. Roads have had sight of this and have no objections in terms of road safety.
The information in the TAF is played down	Extensive consultation has taken place with DFI who have stated in a final consultation that they have no objections to the proposal subject

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

Week Ending 26th January 2024

	to conditions. DfI Roads have reviewed the objectors comments and remain content.
Impact of the floodlights on neighbours amenity to be considered.	The Environmental Health Department of Lisburn Council have been consulted and raised no objections to the proposal. No concerns with regard to amenity have been raised when assessed against Policy OS5 as outlined in the case officer report.
There is no way to ensure that an unacceptable commercial use does not operate from the development in the future.	Any use other than that approved in this application could be in breach of planning.
Photographs showing cars parked at the sand school access.	A condition provided by Roads states that the access is for pedestrian and horse used only, and not for vehicular use. Any vehicle that will use this access will be in breach of this condition.
No measurements are provided as to how far back the boundary wall and hedges will be relocated.	These details were not required by DFI Roads and are not required for the purposes of this assessment.
The proposed 4 x parking spaces will block the door at the northern end of this building.	Extensive consultation has taken place with DFI who have stated in a final consultation that they have no objections to the proposal subject to conditions. The applicant is the owner of this building and has full control over when the building may be in use.
Condition 3 provided by DFI Roads will limit vehicular movement within the yard – leading to an intensification of movements in and out of the vehicular access to the yard and 125 Upper Mealough Roads – leading to another range of road safety issues.	Extensive consultation has taken place with DFI who have stated in a final consultation that they have no objections to the proposal subject to conditions.
The site location plan states that the entrance to the yard is 4m wide while the site layout refers to a	The details stated a minimum distance of 3.5m, which would include a width of 4m. This has been queried with DFI Roads who have stated that the minimum width of a single access they would request is 3.2m with a maximum width of 5.0m as stated in Para 9.3 of DCAN

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

Week Ending 26th January 2024

minimum width of 3.5m – requires clarification.	15 so the applicant stating a minimum access width of 3.5m is acceptable and would include a width of 4.0m.
The layby details need to be clarified – it is not evident where it is to be sited and how it will fit in with the overall access arrangements.	Details of the layby were not requested by DFI Roads however the area falls within the existing hardstanding.
In view of the number of changes made why is a new application not required. Why is the original application not deemed to be relevant and/or invalid.	Changes to plans are often sought through the processing of planning applications, either by the applicant, the authority or a consultee.
Why the operation of the sand school has not been suspended pending the outcome of the planning application.	A warning letter was issued by enforcement on the 23 rd June 2022 advising the applicant to submit a planning application. Enforcement proceedings are stalled pending the outcome of the planning application
Conditions attached to the dwelling at 123 Upper Mealough Road have not been complied with as the splays have not been retained in perpetuity.	Any breach of planning should be reported to the Council Planning Enforcement team
The location, number and size of car and trailer/horse box bays has changed from previously indicated.	The applicant may change details within the application during the processing. No concerns were raised by DFI Roads in this regard.
A condition cannot be imposed that the sand school is for the ancillary use of the applicants, unlike LA05/2021/1167/F.	There will be no condition attached to the application relating to an ancillary use as it has been assessed as a commercial use.
Flood lighting has been used when the sand school operates outside of daylight hours.	Flood lighting is designed to be used outside of daylight hours. No conditions relating to the use of floodlights will be attached to the decision notice.

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

Week Ending 26th January 2024

There is no evidence that horse passports have been provided to support the application.	There is no criteria set out in the policy stating that horse passports are required for the assessment of this application.
The latest drawing does not include all of the previously detailed narrative.	The information provided in all of the drawings are sufficient to complete this assessment and satisfy the requirements of the consultees.

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

Week Ending 26th January 2024

Item Number 3			
Application Reference	LA05/2023/0407/F	Date Valid	15.05.2023
Description of Proposal	Attic Conversion with dormers to front and rear.	Location	64 Woodland Park, Lambeg, Lisburn
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
1	N/A	N/A	N/A
Consideration of Objections			
Issue	Consideration of Issue		
Not notified about the application.	Notice of, and publication of the application were carried out as per Article 8 of the Planning (General Development Procedure) Order (Northern Ireland) 2015 (GDPO). Those neighbours which require neighbour notification as per statutory obligation have been verified via an internal system and as part of the site inspection process.		
Overlooking from front dormer.	The proposed front dormer would be located approximately 13.25m from the front elevation of the closest property opposite. This is contended to be a sufficient distance to prevent overlooking/loss of privacy to an unreasonable degree. It is acknowledged that the associated supplementary guidance notes that except in the most isolated rural location, few households can claim not to be overlooked to some degree		
Not in keeping with the current streetscape.	Whilst it is acknowledged that there is no evidence of dormers to the front of a dwelling within the existing street scene, it is noted that the streetscape is composed of a mix of dwelling types, to include both single and two storey. There is also evidence of attic conversions in the form of raising the ridge height etc. The area does not form part of a designation such as a Conservation Area, nor are there specific dominant architectural styles or details evident. It is contended that the grey finish would allow the dormers to blend unobtrusively with the existing grey roof tiles. Taking the positioning of neighbouring properties (including the two storey dwelling immediately to the south east) into account, it is not contended that there would be long range public views of the proposed dormers. Taking this into account there are no concerns in relation to the impact of the proposal on the existing streetscape.		

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

Week Ending 26th January 2024

Item Number 4			
Application Reference	LA05/2023/0224/O	Date Valid	09.03.2023
Description of Proposal	Demolition of existing dwelling/house and proposed erection of 2no. dwellings/houses, consolidation and relocation of existing site accesses, landscaping and all other associated site works	Location	35 Carnreagh, Royal Hillsborough
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
5	1	N/A	N/A
Consideration of Objections			
Issue	Consideration of Issue		
Carnreagh has become an increasingly busy road, the development is adjacent to a T-junction, 2 bad bends in the road and a children's nursery. There are no traffic calming measures in the area and any additional development will aggravate the road congestion and increase the risk of an accident.	DFI Roads have been consulted on three occasions on the application and offer no objection to the development, providing conditions to be attached to a decision.		

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

Week Ending 26th January 2024

<p>The proximity and height of the proposed new building's gable wall beside my bungalow - the new gable wall will be higher than what currently exists and will deprive my kitchen from light.</p>	<p>This is an outline application and as such no design details have been provided. The height of the gable wall of the proposed dwelling will be assessed at Reserved Matters stage and any potential effects it may have on the neighbouring dwelling. It is noted that the existing dwelling is 1m at the closest point to the boundary with the neighbouring dwelling.</p>
<p>The existing gable facing my bungalow has an intended end section taking it further away from my bungalow - the proposed new dwelling does not offer this and as a result there would be light deprivation impacting my dining room window.</p>	<p>The proposed dwelling closest to No. 37 occupies a smaller footprint than the existing and it is positioned further forward in the site which much of the rear of the adjacent dwelling removed from the new dwelling. No design details are offered at this outline stage. Building heights will be assessed in any subsequent reserved matters application. The new dwellings will present a side-to-side relationship with adjacent dwellings which are generally acceptable in an urban context.</p>
<p>The proposals would have a negative impact upon my family's lifestyle.</p>	<p>The dwellings have been assessed in terms of separation distances to boundaries, overshadowing and overdominance and it is concluded that the distances between the proposed dwelling and any neighbouring properties is acceptable and in line with Departmental guidance.</p>
<p>Closer proximity of the proposed dwelling to No. 37. The changes would prevent full light, deter privacy and threaten wellbeing.</p>	<p>The dwellings have been assessed in terms of separation distances to boundaries, overshadowing and overdominance and it is concluded that the distances between the proposed dwelling and any neighbouring properties is acceptable and in line with Departmental guidance. That said, this is an outline application and as such no design details are offered. The design and height of the dwellings will be assessed at reserved matters stage and also any overlooking concerns.</p>
<p>Demolition of No. 35 would</p>	<p>The dwelling is not listed nor is it within a Conservation Area therefore planning permission is not required for its demolition.</p>

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

Week Ending 26th January 2024

contribute to noise and air pollution.	
The proposed new building has upstairs windows which impact upon privacy.	This is an outline application and no design details have been provided showing the positions of windows. These details will be provided and assessed at reserved matters stage to ensure there is no adverse effects of overlooking on any adjacent properties.

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

Week Ending 26th January 2024

Item Number 5			
Application Reference	LA05/2023/0649/O	Date Valid	08.08.2023
Description of Proposal	Proposed Infill dwelling and associated siteworks	Location	Adjacent to 31 Lurgan Road, Moira, Craigavon
Group Recommendation	Approval	Case Officer	Kevin Maguire
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		
Potential damage from vehicles on access laneway during construction phase.	The laneway in question is private and clarification was sought from the applicant on the ownership status on the area of land which includes the existing access road which is outside of the application site. Following clarification on this point with the applicant should any damage occur to this laneway this is ultimately a civil matter between the owners of the land or those that retain a right of way over the land.		

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

Week Ending 26th January 2024

Item Number 6			
Application Reference	LA05/2023/0454/F	Date Valid	31.05.2023
Description of Proposal	Change of use existing ground floor residential apartment to be used by a residents group including new external access ramps and rear patio doors.	Location	35 Hill Street, Lisburn.
Group Recommendation	Approval	Case Officer	Kevin Maguire
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		
Raised concerns about drainage at the front of the property.	The impact relates primarily to a change of use of an existing building which would not have any impact on drainage to the external areas. Any existing drainage issues would be a matter separate to this planning application and is considered that this development is unlikely to exacerbate this.		
All of the rear curtilages being contained within the red line of the property and potential impact on private amenity.	During the processing of this application the site boundary has been reduced to only include the amenity area to the rear of the property where the change of use is proposed (No 35 Hill Street). Environmental Health have also recommended a condition including hours of operation for the proposed use and will be included in any planning approval.		