

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

Week Ending 20 January 2023

Item Number 1			
Application Reference	LA05/2022/0487/F	Date Valid	12.05.2022
Description of Proposal	Proposed two storey rear and side extension, attic conversion and internal works	Location	1 Breda Park Belfast
Group Recommendation	Approval	Case Officer	Ellen May Gilbert
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		
Loss of privacy.	The application was for a two storey extension to a semi-detached property with conversion of the attic. Amended plans were submitted resulting in the reconfiguration of the first floor to allow for a study with no window to the rear of the property and a roof light proposed to allow light into the room. This limits the opportunity for overlooking. The dormer windows within the attic would be acceptable under permitted development and so could be built without a planning application. The proposal was amended to overcome loss of privacy for neighbouring properties which has been successfully done.		
Proposal is inappropriate for size of site and area.	The proposal is large in size although has shown amendments which consider the neighbouring properties. Whilst it is acknowledged that the configuration of the site results in a smaller rear garden there would still be sufficient amenity space to the front and rear of the site. The existing side garden is to be altered to allow for the extension as well as the parking of 2 cars to the front of the site. There would still be space for an area of grass lawn to the front and side which is in keeping with other properties in the area. As a result the proposal is acceptable within the given site.		
Not in keeping with character of the area.	Directly opposite the proposal there are housing association flats which are 3 storeys and built at a higher level than the application site due to land level changes. Therefore this proposal would not be out of character for the area as there are other types of development as well as semi-detached dwellings in the area. The proposal includes different roof types and levels which is to the rear of the property so would not be seen		

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

Week Ending 20 January 2023

	from the roadside. To the front the existing bay window is proposed to be replicated in the extension so in keeping with the roadside view of the property.
Devaluation of neighbouring properties.	Whilst this is a material planning consideration it is not given determining weight in this instance.

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

Week Ending 20 January 2023

Item Number 2			
Application Reference	LA05/2022/0707/F	Date Valid	26.07.2022
Description of Proposal	Proposed 2 bed detached bungalow	Location	Adjacent and south of 30 Rosssdale Heights Ballymaconaghy Belfast
Group Recommendation	Refusal	Case Officer	Laura McCausland
Reasons for Recommendation			
<p>The proposal is contrary to the SPPS and Policy QD1 (a) of Planning Policy Statement 7: "Quality Residential Environments" in that it fails to respect the surrounding context and would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the local area by virtue of its layout, form and design resulting in overdevelopment of the site.</p> <p>The proposal is contrary to the SPPS and Policy QD1 (f) of Planning Policy Statement 7: "Quality Residential Environments" in that lack of information has been received to demonstrate that adequate and appropriate provision is made for parking.</p> <p>The proposal is contrary to the SPPS and Policy LC1 (b) of the Addendum to PPS 7 "Safeguarding the Character of Established Residential Areas" in that the pattern of development is not in keeping with the overall character and environmental quality of the established residential area.</p>			
Representations			
Objection Letters	Support Letters	Objection Petitions	Support Petitions
0	N/A	N/A	N/A
Consideration of Objections			
Issue	Consideration of Issue		

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

Week Ending 20 January 2023

Item Number 3			
Application Reference	LA05/2021/0658/F	Date Valid	11.06.2021
Description of Proposal	Retrospective vehicle store and new garden store for domestic use ancillary to main dwelling	Location	13a Cockhill Road Maze
Group Recommendation	Approval	Case Officer	Joseph Billham
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		
Car port to be erected on area subject to flooding with inadequate ground works which will add more risk to flooding.	The car port has been removed from the proposal. DFI Rivers have been consulted on the retrospective garden store only and offered no objections. It is the developer's responsibility to assess the flood risk and drainage impact and to mitigate the risk to the development and any impacts beyond the site.		

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

Week Ending 20 January 2023

Item Number 4			
Application Reference	LA05/2022/0845/F	Date Valid	15.09.2022
Description of Proposal	Retrospective application for increased height of flat roof extension to rear (second floor level), roof lights to both flat roof and pitched roof necessary for automatic smoke ventilation. Also minor miscellaneous internal layout changes.	Location	4-6 Main Street Hillsborough
Group Recommendation	Approval	Case Officer	Brenda Ferguson
Reasons for Recommendation			
All relevant planning material considerations have been satisfied.			
Representations			
Objection Letters	Support Letters	Objection Petitions	Support Petitions
3	N/A	N/A	N/A
Consideration of Objections			
Issue	Consideration of Issue		
Installation of a Glass Balustrade and roof terrace which is visible in conservation area.	To address concerns relating to amenity the glass balustrade and roof terrace have both removed from the drawings. A door opening will remain permanently locked with access only for maintenance by staff. Planning are content that this resolves the concerns in respect of residential amenity.		
The flat-roofed extension is incongruent with the historic conservation area, and again, is in a highly visible location due to its height and materials.	The height of the rear second storey flat roof was lifted on site by 450mm as a result of the location of the existing roof structure in the front of the building to gain clear head room. (These works have already been carried out but not in compliance with the previous approval) HED (Historic Buildings Unit) have been consulted and are content with this increase in height following discussions on site regarding the unauthorised works. Conservation Area Team have not raised concerns relating to this aspect. We have been communicating with the owner and the contractor and following a site meeting on 15 th June 2002 with representatives of council		

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

Week Ending 20 January 2023

	enforcement team where inappropriate works were highlighted, we are content that these have been rectified in line with policy.
Smoke detection devices are highly visible and do not respect the integrity of the building and are damaging to historic views over the site.	Roof lights were added to the flat roof and the rear slope of the existing roof in order to provide necessary smoke ventilation as required by Building Control. HED and Conservation both have no concerns relating to the proposed AOV's.
Increase in the size of Bedroom 1 which is bigger than previously approved	Changes to the internal layout arrangement have been mentioned on the proposal description on the P1 form. The internal changes are considered to be acceptable in planning terms and have been agreed with HED on site.
The windows in the new extension are inconsistent with the windows in the older part of the building and look odd, inconsistent and frankly cheap.	The design and finishes have been previously agreed with HED and Conservation. Visually, the windows are acceptable in terms of materials and design.
Site area inaccurate on application form	The site area is consistent with the area as per the previous application and there has been no increase in size of the site.
Unauthorised works to the building due to pre-commencement conditions having not been met. Car parking cannot therefore be achieved	HED and Conservation are now content with the retrospective works and DFI roads have no objections to the proposal. The Design and Access statement states that there are two existing spaces and 2 parking spaces to be leased behind 5, The Square in Hillsborough to be operated on a concierge basis. This is as was previously agreed.
It is noted that the description of the works is incorrect and does not identify all new items which deviates from the approved planning drawings.	All design and layout changes as shown on the drawings are now agreed with HED and Conservation. The proposal description is a summary of works and all changes are annotated and included on the drawings. The roof terrace and glass balustrade have been removed from the drawings. In planning terms, the amendments are acceptable. It is considered that the works will not detract from the listed building not will they have a detrimental impact on the setting of the listed building or the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. The retrospective works are policy compliance in terms of the SPPS, PPS 3, PPS 6 and PPS 16.

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

Week Ending 20 January 2023

Item Number 5			
Application Reference	LA05/2022/0848/F	Date Valid	15.09.2022
Description of Proposal	Installation of 2 no. canvas awnings above cafe shop windows to provide cover for proposed pavement seating area and fitting of 2 no. existing external light fittings to shopfront.	Location	4-6 Main Street Hillsborough
Group Recommendation	Approval	Case Officer	Brenda Ferguson
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		
Canvas awnings are damaging clutter on this building. They will partially obscure the historic shop-front and affect the historic interest of the building.	HED (Historic Buildings) and the Conservation Officer have both been consulted regarding this application. Following the submission of amended plans they are now both content with the proposal for the awnings and lighting.		
The works proposed in this application also require listed building consent.	A listed building consent application has been submitted alongside this application, planning ref. LA05/2022/0681/LBC. HED are content with the works proposed.		
The awnings do not relate to the use of the building.	The awnings are to provide cover for a proposed seating area as stated in the proposal description.		

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

Week Ending 20 January 2023

<p>The drawings of the awnings do not show the alterations described in the design concept.</p>	<p>These details have been provided and are now shown on the amended street front elevations as indicated on drawing 02/B.</p>
<p>Strip lighting proposed along the fascia is to illuminate the fascia signage and is unacceptable</p>	<p>Following changes requested in HED's response dated 21/10/2022, the illumination has been removed. HED are content with the proposal as are Conservation.</p>
<p>Soft lighting is a meaningless description.</p>	<p>The wording of the proposal is acceptable and Environmental Health are content with the proposed lighting as indicated on the drawings.</p>
<p>The associated advert application noted the signage proposed is not illuminated.</p>	<p>The relevant consultees have been re-consulted with this amendment and are now content.</p>
<p>The tables and chairs, recorded in the application description and shown in drawing No3 are not in the application site area (drawing No1) and cannot form part of this application.</p>	<p>The table and chairs shown are for indicative purposes only and the outdoor seating is subject to a pavement café licence under the Licensing of Pavement Cafes Act (Northern Ireland) 2014 which the applicant must obtain prior to the use of the outdoor seating area.</p>
<p>Once again the wrong site area is noted in the application form.</p>	<p>The site area has been checked and is seen to be accurate and acceptable.</p>
<p>The awnings will damage the character and appearance of this part of the conservation area, the historic interest of this building and the setting of neighbouring listed buildings.</p>	<p>HED and Conservation are content with the proposed awnings and external lighting and it is considered that the proposal will not damage the appearance of the character of the Conservation area, or the historic building and its setting. The proposal is compliant with planning policy.</p>

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

Week Ending 20 January 2023

<p>Safety issues resulting from the proposed development – awnings, seating and pedestrians on pavement area will increase risk of accidents.</p>	<p>DFI Roads have raised no concerns in relation to road safety. The outdoor seating area is separate legislation and subject to the obtainment of a pavement café licence under the Licensing of Pavement Cafes Act (Northern Ireland) 2014.</p>
<p>Impact on a historical shop front, and consistency in a conservation area.</p>	<p>Following the submission of amended plans the Conservation officer and HED are content with the proposal and information provided.</p>