

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

Week Ending 18 February 2022

Item Number 1			
Application Reference	LA05/2021/0716/F	Date Valid	22.06.2021
Description of Proposal	Erection of dwelling and a garage in compliance with PPS 21 CTY2A and SPPS	Location	South east of 55 Balliesmills Road, Cargacreevy, Lisburn, BT27 6XJ
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
17	N/A	N/A	N/A
Consideration of Objections			
Issue	Consideration of Issue		
Area of the site and fear of further development	<p>Concern has been raised that the site is only half the area rather than the taking up the whole agricultural field. Fears are expressed that the proposal is to create a vacant space to the rear to facilitate another dwelling, as it is believed that by relocating the garage it makes room for a laneway to the vacant space to the rear.</p> <p>The red line of the application encompasses the whole field however the curtilage matches that which has been approved in the previous application. Any future development would be the subject of a further planning application</p>		
Unauthorised works already taken place on site	<p>Concern has been raised that the development that has been applied for has already begun on site. The opinion is expressed that this should not have been done until authority from planning/building control was given and asks why this has happened and that it is blatant disregard for the process.</p> <p>The planning unit is aware that the development has begun on site and advise that any unauthorised development is undertaken at the developer/owners own risk. The matter has been referred to the enforcement team for investigation</p>		
Traffic	<p>Concerns have been expressed about additional traffic on an already busy road.</p> <p>The proposal is for one domestic dwelling, which is essentially a change of house type from the previous extant approval on the site. The proposal makes provision for a safe access and there is provision for the parking and manoeuvring of three vehicles within the</p>		

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

Week Ending 18 February 2022

	<p>site. The proposal complies with PPS 3 Access, Movement and Parking. DfI Roads have been consulted on the proposal and have no objections</p>
<p>Additional sewerage drainage</p>	<p>Concern has been raised about the stress on sewerage drainage from any additional property.</p> <p>The proposed septic tank and soakaway is in the same position as the extant approval for a dwelling and garage on the site. Water Management Unit had no objection to the previous application and no changes are made to the sewerage aspect of the proposal. And Environmental health have raised no objections</p>
<p>Residential amenity / negative impact on life of neighbouring residents / overlooking / loss of privacy</p>	<p>The view has been expressed that the life of neighbouring residents will be negatively affected by the proposal. Concern is also raised that the proposal would cause overlooking and loss of privacy.</p> <p>The change of a detached garage to an attached garage with different internal configuration above for a bedroom with dressing room and ensuite is considered to be acceptable. The small increase in size to the dwelling from the previous approval would not have a negative impact on the neighbouring properties. The separation distances between the proposal and neighbouring dwellings is considered to be acceptable. No overlooking into private amenity space or loss of light would be caused by the proposal. It is considered that the proposal would not have a negative impact on any neighbouring residents. Environmental Health have been consulted and have raised no objections</p>
<p>Noise pollution</p>	<p>Concerns have been raised about the proposal causing noise pollution.</p> <p>The proposal is for one domestic property. It is considered that one domestic property would not generate unacceptable noise. Environmental Health have been consulted and have no raised no objections to the proposal</p>
<p>Devaluation of neighbouring properties</p>	<p>Concern is raised that the proposal would devalue neighbouring properties.</p> <p>The impact on value of property is a material consideration that is not given determining weight</p>
<p>Land ownership</p>	<p>A neighbour has provide a folio map detailing land in their ownership. They ask how the builder plans on accessing the site without crossing over their property.</p> <p>A P2 Challenge was issued to the agent and a response provided. Land ownership is a legal issue and is not a planning consideration. The onus is on the applicant to ensure that they have ownership/control of all lands necessary to implement a planning approval</p>
<p>Notification of consideration of previous approval</p>	<p>An objector has raised issue with the awarding of planning permission for the dwelling in October 2020, in particular why they did not have opportunity to raise the objections and concerns at the meeting when</p>

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

Week Ending 18 February 2022

	<p>considering the application and did not get notification the application was to be considered.</p> <p>The extant approval on the site was approved in October 2020 under application LA05/2019/0239/F and it was a delegated application. All third party representations/objections were considered and once a recommendation was made by the planning unit, the application was placed on the weekly delegated list for consideration. The delegated list is published weekly and the application was not called in to be determined by the planning committee</p>
Proposal does not comply with policy CTY 2a	<p>Concerns have been raised that the proposal does not sit within a cluster, that it does not appear as a visual entity, that it is not associated with a focal point or at a cross roads, that the site is not suitably enclosed and not bound on two sides, that the development of the site cannot be absorbed into the exiting cluster and that the development would adversely impact on residential amenity.</p> <p>The proposal sits within an existing cluster of development, the cluster appears as a visual entity in the landscape, it is associated with a cross roads, the site is enclosed and bound by development on at least two sides. The development of the site can be easily absorbed in to the cluster through rounding off and consolidation and it would not have a negative impact on residential amenity. The proposal has been assessed against policy CTY 2a and is policy complaint. Also the planning history shows that there is an extant approval on the site that accepts that a dwelling on the site complies with CTY 2a</p>
Proposal does not comply with policy CTY 13	<p>Concerns have been raised that the proposal would be prominent, that the is not enclosed by boundaries, that the dwelling would rely on new landscaping for integration; that the site design is not appropriate for the site and its locality; that the dwelling would not blend with the landform and that it would clearly be visible.</p> <p>The proposed garage is being added on to the rear of the dwelling. The small increase in size and change to the design compared to the extant approval is considered to be acceptable in this context and the proposal would not be a prominent feature in the landscape. The assessment of integration is not a test of invisibility by how it is viewed from critical viewpoints and how it sits in the landscape. The proposal is enclosed by existing boundary treatments and would blend into the existing landform. It is considered that the proposal would integrate sufficiently into the countryside. The design complies with Building on Tradition and is considered to be appropriate for the site and it locality. The proposal has been assessed against policy CTY 13 and is considered to be policy compliant in this regard</p>
Neighbour notification	<p>Concerns were raised about neighbour notification.</p> <p>The Council has fulfilled its statutory obligations with regards to neighbour notification and all relevant neighbours have been notified</p>

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

Week Ending 18 February 2022

<p>Objects to a third dwelling and its impact</p>	<p>The view is expressed that they were not happy about the two dwellings already passed and feels that a third dwelling would cause a detrimental impact.</p> <p>The proposal is not for a third dwelling, it is essentially a change of house type from that previously approved extant permission on the site under planning application LA05/2019/0239/F.</p>
---	---

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

Week Ending 18 February 2022

Item Number 2			
Application Reference	LA05/2021/0287/F	Date Valid	11.03.2021
Description of Proposal	Full application to change of use from ground floor and first floor offices, sales & service for electronic engineers (S/1992/0128) to ground floor coffee house, first floor general offices including alterations of the internal ground floor layout to provide public toilet facilities, kitchen, preparation area and service counter. This will also include alterations to the ground floor rear elevation of the premises. The rear out buildings, garage and work shop to remain as existing (Additional roads information)	Location	25 Lambeg Road, Lambeg, Lisburn, BT27 4QA
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
21	8	N/A	N/A
Consideration of Objections			
Issue	Consideration of Issue		
Proposal would result in inadequate parking provision and would prejudice road safety	DfI Roads have been consulted on the application and have no objection. DfI Roads have advised that on-street parking is available within walking distance of the development, and meets the policy criteria as set out in Parking Standards. DfI Roads can offer no policy reason on roads grounds why this application should not be allowed. It is considered the proposal is compliant with Planning Policy Statement 3 Access Movement and Parking.		

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

Week Ending 18 February 2022

<p>Health and safety issue - there will be reduced visibility due to associated parking</p>	<p>It is acknowledged there are existing parking pressures in the Station Road area from residents, users of the Lambeg Railway Station and from patrons of Lambeg Park. However whilst the proposal as presented may have a detrimental impact on surrounding on-street parking, as on-street parking is available within walking distance and meets the policy criteria as set out in the parking standards it is considered this would not be significant. As such it is contended a refusal reason on this basis would not be reasonable and could not be sustained. Both DfI Roads and Environmental Health have been consulted and have no objections to the proposal. It is therefore contended that the proposal as presented will not compromise access, movement and parking standards.</p>
<p>The information submitted with the application is not consistent. The parking survey submitted is flawed</p>	<p>Additional documentation was submitted during the processing of the application. It is considered there is sufficient information provided to make an informed assessment and the information submitted meets the relevant policy requirements</p>
<p>Vehicles in the area exceed the speed limit - speed ramps should be installed</p>	<p>Speeding in the area should be reported to the police for investigation and would be a matter that would fall outside the remit of planning. Any request for speed ramps made to the Council will be considered however do not form part of this planning application process</p>
<p>The character and visual impact on the listed building should be preserved</p>	<p>HED (Historic Buildings) has considered the impacts of the proposal on the listed building and on the basis of the information provided are content with the proposal, as presented subject to appropriate conditions.</p> <p>A listed building consent (Planning Reference LA05/2021/0159/LBC) and an advertisement consent (Planning Reference LA05/2021/0160/A) have been processed in parallel with this application in relation to this proposed development and in connection with the Grade 2 listed building. All drawings for both Full and LBC applications will be aligned without conflict and determined in tandem.</p>