

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

**Week Ending 21 October 2022**

<b>Item Number 1</b>			
<b>Application Reference</b>	LA05/2021/0823/F	<b>Date Valid</b>	22.07.2021
<b>Description of Proposal</b>	The proposal involves construction of a replacement wwps consisting of: an underground wet well wwps shaft; an underground storm tank; underground associated chambers and pipework. Existing access lane to be resurfaced. Above ground features include the replacement control kiosk, to house m & e equipment, a wash water booster set and an accompanying 6m high telemetry pole to include a floodlight. Noise and odour surveys have been undertaken	<b>Location</b>	Waringfield WwPS, Waringfield Avenue - Adjacent to Number 15, Moira, Craigavon
<b>Group Recommendation</b>	Approval	<b>Case Officer</b>	Catherine Gray
<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>
3	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>Consideration of Objections</b>			
<b>Issue</b>	<b>Consideration of Issue</b>		
Impact of flood lighting	<p>Concern has been raised about the impact of the flood lighting, about light spill and its impact on bat activity. The view is expressed that that the artificial lighting would undoubtedly effect this protected species and also that the flood light would illuminate the entire rear of their property.</p> <p>The proposal is located within the Settlement Development Limit adjacent to existing housing which has existing light spill. There are no concerns in relation to bats and no existing trees would be impacted. The agent has confirmed that the flood light will only be</p>		

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

**Week Ending 21 October 2022**

	<p>operational during infrequent emergency works to the pumping station and that the lighting will not remain on for long periods of time.</p> <p>Environmental Health have been consulted on the proposal. They note the letters of objection and specifically in relation to lighting, odour and noise. Environmental Health advice that the development will not cause a loss in amenity with respect to noise, odour and light and have no objection to the proposal.</p>
Noise	<p>The view is expressed that on occasions the night time noise levels of the existing wwps can be intrusive and that vibration or a low level hum can intrude into the front room and bedrooms of property 12 Glebe Place.</p> <p>The proposal is for a new replacement wwps, an upgrade to the existing facility. Environmental Health have been consulted on the proposal and also note the letters of objection and specifically in relation to lighting, odour and noise. Environmental Health advice that the development will not cause a loss in amenity with respect to noise, odour and light and have no objection to the proposal.</p>
Access to land	<p>The question is asked if there are any plans to fence/gate the access lane from Waringfield Avenue and the field at the end of the laneway.</p> <p>The proposal does not involve any new fence or gate to the access laneway.</p>
Odour	<p>The view is expressed that the odour assessment does not give any confidence that future odour will be non-intrusive.</p> <p>An odour assessment has been submitted for consideration. Environmental Health have been consulted on the proposal and also note the letters of objection and specifically in relation to lighting, odour and noise. Environmental Health advise that the development will not cause a loss in amenity with respect to noise, odour and light and have no objection subject to the development being undertaken in strict accordance with the odour management plan received by the Council 29<sup>th</sup> July 2021.</p>
Potential damage	<p>Concerns about possible damage to fence line and to the trees in neighbours' property as there has already been damage caused by the recent clearance for access to site.</p> <p>When implementing a planning permission, the onus is on the owner/developer to ensure that no damage is done to neighbouring properties. This would be a civil matter between the two relevant parties.</p>

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

**Week Ending 21 October 2022**

<b>Item Number 2</b>			
<b>Application Reference</b>	LA05/2021/0934/F	<b>Date Valid</b>	26.08.2021
<b>Description of Proposal</b>	Amended Access to commenced approval LA05/2018/0125/RM	<b>Location</b>	Adjacent to (south west of) 9 River Road Cargycreevy Lisburn
<b>Group Recommendation</b>	Approval	<b>Case Officer</b>	Joanna Magee
<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>
1	1	N/A	N/A
<b>Consideration of Objections</b>			
<b>Issue</b>	<b>Consideration of Issue</b>		
Land ownership concerns	Land ownership is a legal issue and not a planning matter and would in this case appear to be a civil matter if a dispute arose at a later stage.		
Existing and proposed soakaways	The points raised in the letter are for clarification and are to avoid any disagreement or dispute at a later stage during construction.		
Laneway accessing no 7 and 7a River Road	The letter indicates they have a legal right of way over laneway and they have maintained the laneway over many years. Title deeds enclosed show the laneway.		
Letter of Support from previous applicant	The previous applicant states that the soakaway of no 9 was contained within the garden at 9 River Road and does not appear to enter the application site or adjacent field. During the consent to discharge they tested the outfall from their septic tank.		

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

**Week Ending 21 October 2022**

<b>Item Number 3</b>			
<b>Application Reference</b>	LA05/2022/0495/F	<b>Date Valid</b>	13.05.2022
<b>Description of Proposal</b>	Construction of external ramped access, landing & handrail to ATM machine to accommodate wheelchair and ambulant disabled access	<b>Location</b>	Danske Bank, 62-66 Bow Street, Lisburn
<b>Group Recommendation</b>	Approval	<b>Case Officer</b>	Ellen-May Gilbert
<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>
1	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>Consideration of Objections</b>			
<b>Issue</b>	<b>Consideration of Issue</b>		
Proposal will reduce pavement so where will bank security van/lorry park.	This is not a material planning consideration given weight in this assessment. DFI Roads were consulted with regards to the application and they have no objections to the proposal subject to a condition and informatives.		

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

**Week Ending 21 October 2022**

<b>Item Number 4</b>			
<b>Application Reference</b>	LA05/2021/0324/F	<b>Date Valid</b>	24.03.2021
<b>Description of Proposal</b>	Conversion of existing dwelling to 2 apartments	<b>Location</b>	49 Castlevue Park Moirá
<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 Policies LC1 and LC2 of PPS 7 Addendum: 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 existing residential neighbourhood and the original property is not greater than 150 square metres gross internal floorspace. The proposal would also set a precedent for further apartment development in this established residential area eroding the existing character of Castlevue Park.</p>			
<b>Representations</b>			
<b>Objection Letters</b>	<b>Support Letters</b>	<b>Objection Petitions</b>	<b>Support Petitions</b>
<b>9</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>N/A</b>
<b>Consideration of Objections</b>			
<b>Issue</b>	<b>Consideration of Issue</b>		
<p>Similar to previous application on the site, the original property does not have 150 sq. m or more floorspace. Long planning history on the site 2009-2014 with dismissed appeal to convert the application site to 2 no. apartments. No difference. LA05/2016/0290/F is an extension to the dwelling house only.</p>	<p>It is acknowledged that a previous application S/2011/0004/F was refused planning permission on 04<sup>th</sup> February 2012 and dismissed at planning appeal 2012/A0121 on 27 March 2013.</p> <p>However this application is assessed on its own merits. As demonstrated by the refusal reason and recommendation it is agreed that the proposal is contrary to Policy LC2 of PPS 7 Addendum: 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 existing residential neighbourhood and the original property is not greater than 150 square metres gross internal floor space. It is acknowledged that planning permission was granted under application LA05/2016/0290/F for a two storey rear and side extension to the existing dwelling on 08<sup>th</sup> March 2017.</p>		

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

**Week Ending 21 October 2022**

<p>The proposed site is not located in a town centre.</p>	<p>It is acknowledged the proposed site is not located in a town centre. The proposed site is located within the development limit of Moira. The existing two storey semi-detached dwelling is located at the end of a cul de sac within an established residential area. It is considered the conversion of existing dwelling to 2 apartments would not result in a quality and sustainable residential development.</p>
<p>Restricted access to the rear of several houses, this development would only add to this. Insufficient parking.</p>	<p>DFI Roads have commented on the proposed layout, parking and access arrangements and offers no objection to this development proposal. The proposal provides 3 no. in curtilage car parking spaces to the rear of the site. There is also additional space for on street parking in general for residents and visitors. It is considered the proposal complies with Planning Policy Statement 3: Access, Movement and Parking.</p>
<p>No demand or need for flats in the area – there are no other flats in the Castlevue Park</p>	<p>It is acknowledged the character of the area consists of single family dwellings of a similar size and design with no other apartment developments.</p>
<p>Loss of privacy</p>	<p>The proposed first floor apartment would present 2 no. windows and 1 French door to the rear elevation – 1 no. window on the original building would serve a bedroom and 1 no. window and French door located on the proposed rear extension would serve a living/dining area. The proposed first floor apartment presents 2 no. windows on the side elevation to serve a kitchen and store.</p> <p>It is acknowledged there will be some degree of overlooking from the upper floor windows into adjacent private amenity areas. However given the distance and the angle of view it is contended any resultant overlooking would not be significant. Furthermore the scale and massing of the proposal is similar to that approved under application LA05/2016/0290/F for a two storey rear extension and the distance between this proposal and the common boundary of neighbouring properties would be the same. It is contended there is no unacceptable adverse loss of privacy to neighbouring properties.</p>
<p>Concerns expressed regarding potential conflict of interest.</p>	<p>All planning applications are assessed in an open and transparent manner in line with the code of conduct for local government employees.</p>

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

**Week Ending 21 October 2022**

<b>Item Number 5</b>			
<b>Application Reference</b>	LA05/2020/0853/O	<b>Date Valid</b>	26.10.2020
<b>Description of Proposal</b>	New dwelling (detached)	<b>Location</b>	Between 23a and 23 Ballinderry Road Aghalee Craigavon
<b>Group Recommendation</b>	Refusal	<b>Case Officer</b>	Catherine Gray
<b>Reasons for Recommendation</b>			
<p>The proposal is contrary to the SPPS and Policy CTY1 of Planning Policy Statement 21, Sustainable Development in the Countryside in that there are no overriding reasons why this development is essential in this rural location and could not be located within a settlement.</p> <p>The proposal is contrary to the SPPS and Policy CTY 8 of Planning Policy Statement 21, Sustainable Development in the Countryside, in that it fails to meet the provisions for an infill dwelling as the application site does not respect the existing development pattern along the frontage in terms of size, scale and siting, and would if permitted result in the addition of ribbon development.</p> <p>The proposal is contrary to the SPPS and Policy CTY14 of Planning Policy Statement 21, Sustainable Development in the Countryside in that, the proposal would, if permitted result in a suburban style build-up of development when viewed with existing and approved buildings, not respect the traditional pattern of settlement exhibited in that area, add to a ribbon of development and would therefore result in a detrimental change to (further erode) the rural character of the countryside.</p>			
<b>Representations</b>			
<b>Objection Letters</b>	<b>Support Letters</b>	<b>Objection Petitions</b>	<b>Support Petitions</b>
0	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 21 October 2022**

Item Number 6			
<b>Application Reference</b>	LA05/2021/1235/O	<b>Date Valid</b>	15.11.2021
<b>Description of Proposal</b>	One detached house for a dwelling	<b>Location</b>	Next to 7 Kings Oak Meadow Lisburn
<b>Group Recommendation</b>	Refusal	<b>Case Officer</b>	Laura McCausland
Reasons for Recommendation			
<p>The proposal is contrary to the Strategic Planning Policy Statement and Policy CTY 1 of Planning Policy Statement 21, in that there are no overriding reasons why this development is essential in this rural location.</p> <p>The proposal is contrary to the Strategic Planning Policy Statement and CTY 15 of Planning Policy Statement 21 and in that in that the proposal would if permitted result in urban sprawl and mar the distinction between the existing settlement of Kesh Bridge and the surrounding countryside.</p> <p>The proposal is contrary to the Strategic Planning Policy Statement and Policy CTY 14 of Planning Policy Statement 21 in that the proposal would if permitted result in a suburban style build-up of development when viewed with existing buildings and the siting of the proposal is not sympathetic to the rural character in general and of the particular locality in that it creates urban sprawl beyond the established settlement boundary of Kesh Bridge.</p> <p>The proposal is contrary to the Strategic Planning Policy Statement and Policy Planning Policy Statement 2 NH5 in that, it has not been demonstrated that the removal of mature vegetation to accommodate the proposal would not negatively impact upon, or damage to, habitats, species or features.</p> <p>The proposal is contrary to the Strategic Planning Policy Statement and Policy Planning Policy Statement 3 Policies AMP2, Access, Movement and Parking, in that the applicant has failed to submit information as requested to demonstrate the access will not prejudice road safety; adequate provision for in curtilage car parking has been made.</p> <p>The proposal is contrary to the Strategic Planning Policy Statement and Policy Planning Policy Statement 7 Policy QD 1 of PPS 7 –Quality Residential Developments and Policy LC 1 of the Addendum to PPS 7 Safeguarding the Character of Established Residential Areas in that the scheme, if permitted, would result in unacceptable damage to the local character and create an unacceptable living environment, unsatisfactory access, layout, and inadequate provision of amenity space.</p> <p>The proposal is considered contrary to the Strategic Planning Policy Statement, Policy QD 1 of PPS 7- Quality Residential Environments and Policy LC 1 of the addendum to PPS 7- Safeguarding the Character of established residential areas in that the development does not respect the character of the area, if permitted, would result in the loss of significant mature trees which contribute to the amenity of the immediate locality and wider area.</p>			



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

**Week Ending 21 October 2022**

<b>Representations</b>			
<b>Objection Letters</b>	<b>Support Letters</b>	<b>Objection Petitions</b>	<b>Support Petitions</b>
7	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>Consideration of Objections</b>			
<b>Issue</b>	<b>Consideration of Issue</b>		
Landownership, incorrect details submitted on Ques 27. P1 form cert A Folio map provided.	Whilst Land ownership disputes are a civil matter the applicant was requested to provide clarity around this issue and revise the site location map to demonstrate ownership of adjoining lands and confirm that P1 had been completed correctly. No information has been received. Folio map submitted by the objector identifies land within the red line to be outside the ownership of the applicant.		
Lack of information has been submitted to confirm where the dwelling is to be located.	DFI Roads have also expressed their concern with the proposal and it is agreed that it has not been demonstrated that the site can accommodate in curtilage parking, dwelling and sufficient private residential amenity space. No information has been received to demonstrate that the proposed development will not impinge upon existing development or prejudice the flow of traffic or other road users.		
Proposed development may create overlooking and loss of privacy.	It is agreed that the removal of trees to accommodate the proposal may create the potential for overlooking and negatively impact upon neighbouring existing residential amenity and loss of privacy.		
Impact of noise from project works on those working at home.	No material weight has been attached to this issue as construction works would be carried out during business hours.		
The site is located outside the development limit of Kesh Bridge.	It is agreed that the site is located in the open countryside outside the development limit of Kesh Bridge		
Proposal doesn't meet any criteria for a dwelling in the countryside as set out in PPS21 and therefore fundamentally contrary to PPS21 Policy CTY1.	It is agreed that the principle of development does not meet criteria set out in SPPS and PPS21 CTY1.		
Applicant chosen only to neighbour notify an address fabricated/set up	Although the applicant may have only included one address on Question 28 of the P1 Form the neighbour notification process has been carried out in accordance to Statutory Requirements.		



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

**Week Ending 21 October 2022**

<p>post box, in an attempt by the applicant to better their chances of a cheap site.</p>	
--	--

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

**Week Ending 21 October 2022**

<b>Item Number 7</b>			
<b>Application Reference</b>	LA05/2021/0698/F	<b>Date Valid</b>	18.06.2021
<b>Description of Proposal</b>	Temporary construction access as part of enabling works to carry out extant approval LA05/2015/0338/F	<b>Location</b>	Land between Laurelgrove Manor Laurelgrove Crescent Bracken Hill Knocknabracken Road and Brook Hall Belfast
<b>Group Recommendation</b>	Approval	<b>Case Officer</b>	Joanne Doran
<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>
2	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>Consideration of Objections</b>			
<b>Issue</b>	<b>Consideration of Issue</b>		
Proposed access is situated on a blind bend & is the scene of multiple accidents. Unsuitable for large construction vehicles.	DfI Roads were consulted in regard to the road safety, new access arrangements and manoeuvring of vehicles. DfI Roads replied on the 05/08/2021 offering no objections to the proposal and attached relevant conditions and informatives regarding visibility splays and access gradients.		
Nearby dwellings will be subject to dust, debris & noise.	An informative attached to the Decision Notice requires the applicant to take precautions to prevent the deposit of mud and other debris on the adjacent road by vehicles travelling to and from the construction site. Any mud, refuse, etc deposited on the road as a result of the development, must be removed immediately by the operator/contractor.		