

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

Week Ending 16 June 2023

Item Number 1			
Application Reference	LA05/2022/0395/O	Date Valid	22.04.2022
Description of Proposal	Proposed site for 2 infill dwellings	Location	Lands between no. 12 & no. 14 School Road Crossnacreevy
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
2	2	N/A	N/A
Consideration of Objections			
Issue	Consideration of Issue		
Planning application LA05/2022/1162/O	<p>Concerns have been raised over planning application LA05/2022/1162/O which is an application further along the School Road for infill development and also the view is expressed that that application has been incorrectly identified.</p> <p>Application LA05/2022/1162/O is a separate application from this proposed development. The concerns raised in the representation about application LA05/2022/1162/O has been passed onto that application for consideration.</p>		
Cumulative impact with planning application LA05/2022/1162/O	<p>Concerns have been raised about the cumulative impact of this proposal with planning application LA05/2022/1162/O.</p> <p>Planning application LA05/2022/1162/O is still under consideration and the planning history of this site and the surrounding area is considered as part of the processing of the application.</p>		
Does not meet the requirements of policy CTY 8	<p>The view is expressed that the proposal does not meet the requirements of policy CTY 8.</p> <p>The proposal has been fully assessed against the requirements of policy CTY 8 and it is considered that the proposal complies with the exception as set out in policy CTY 8.</p>		
Character and appearance of the area.	<p>The view has been expressed that the proposal would have a negative impact on the character and appearance of the area.</p> <p>The proposal has been assessed against the SPPS and policies CTY 8, 13 and 14 of PPS 21 and it is considered that the proposal would not have a negative impact on the character and appearance of the area.</p>		

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

Week Ending 16 June 2023

<p>Road Safety Concerns.</p>	<p>The view has been expressed that the development of the site would increase existing road safety concerns on a very narrow winding country road with poor sight lines and several 90 degree bends.</p> <p>The proposal has been assessed against PPS 3 Access, Movement and Parking. DfI Roads have also been consulted and have raised no objections to the proposed development.</p>
------------------------------	---

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

Week Ending 16 June 2023

Item Number 2			
Application Reference	LA05/2022/0807/O	Date Valid	01.09.2022
Description of Proposal	Proposed dwelling and garage	Location	Lands 20m east of 123a Saintfield Road Lisburn
Group Recommendation	Refusal	Case Officer	Brenda Ferguson
Reasons for Recommendation			
<p>The proposal is contrary to the SPPS and Policy CTY 8 of Planning Policy Statement 21 - Sustainable Development in the Countryside, in that the proposed development does not respect the existing development pattern along the frontage of the Saintfield Road in terms of size, scale, and plot size.</p> <p>The proposal is contrary to the SPPS and Policy CTY 14 of PPS 21, in that it does not respect the traditional pattern of settlement exhibited in the area and would result in a suburban style build up when viewed with existing buildings therefore causing detrimental change to the rural character.</p> <p>The proposal is contrary to the SPPS and Planning Policy Statement 3, Access, Movement and Parking, Policy AMP 3, in that it would, if permitted, result in the intensification of use of an existing access onto a Protected Route, thereby prejudicing the free flow of traffic and conditions of general safety.</p>			
Representations			
Objection Letters	Support Letters	Objection Petitions	Support Petitions
2	N/A	N/A	N/A
Consideration of Objections			
Issue	Consideration of Issue		
Inadequate information on the supporting statement (compliance with Policy CTY 6)	Proposal has been amended to remove the reference to Policy CTY 6 and is no longer assessed under this policy.		
Proposal is contrary to Policy CTY 6	Proposal has been amended and description no longer refers to Policy CTY 6 of PPS 21		
A dwelling on site would add to	The site is considered to fall within an otherwise substantial and continuous built up frontage therefore is considered under the exception		

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

Week Ending 16 June 2023

ribbon development	to the ribbon development policy, however further to its assessment has been found to fail CTY8.
Proposal would create a suburban style build-up of development when viewed with existing buildings	It is agreed the proposal would create a build-up of development and is contrary to Policy CTY 14 of PPS 21 and this is reflected in the refusal reason.
Site does not lie within a substantial and continuous built up frontage. No. 23 nor its garage have a frontage to the Saintfield Road.	The frontage along the road either side of the site has been considered. No. 23 is said to have a frontage to the road as there is no defined boundary separating the curtilage from the road.
Access driveway does not constitute a frontage to the road – proposal contrary to Policy CTY 8	This point is accepted however it is the curtilage of the dwelling at no. 23 that is considered to share a frontage with the road. It is however acknowledged that the proposal is contrary to Policy CTY 8 in relation to the plot size and settlement pattern.
Proposal contrary to Policy AMP 3 of PPS 3 “Access to protected routes”	<p>The view is expressed that the proposal contrary to Policy AMP 3 of PPS 3 “Access to protected routes” as it does not fall within one of the four circumstances in which a new access will be permitted on “other protected routes” outside settlement limits.</p> <p>It is agreed the proposal is contrary to Policy AMP 3 of PPS 3 as it does not meet the criteria for development in the countryside and is not therefore considered to be an exception to the policy. This is reflected in the refusal reason.</p>