

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

Week Ending 24th June 2022

Item Number 1			
Application Reference	LA05/2019/0875/O	Date Valid	27.08.2019
Description of Proposal	Replacement Dwelling	Location	58 Creevytennant Road Creevytennant Ballynahinch
Group Recommendation	Approval	Case Officer	Maire-Claire O'Neill
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		
Land Ownership	Certificate A has been signed on the P1 form which outlines that the applicant is in possession of every part of the land which the application relates to. This was also confirmed in email from agent.		
Public Right of Way	The grant of planning permission does not confer title and no evidence was found to substantiate the claim that the proposal encroached on a public right of way. DfI Roads were consulted with regards to this application and offered no objection.		
Removal of large trees	No detail was submitted in relation to removal of any trees. Details of landscaping existing and proposed would be considered at the Reserved Matters stage of the application.		

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

Week Ending 24th June 2022

Item Number 2			
Application Reference	LA05/2021/1228/O	Date Valid	12.11.2021
Description of Proposal	Detached 2 storey dwelling and associated hard and soft landscaping including alterations to existing car parking area to front garden of No 23 Muskett Drive	Location	Land adjacent to 23 Muskett Drive Carryduff
Group Recommendation	Refusal	Case Officer	Brenda Ferguson
Reasons for Recommendation			
<p>The proposal is contrary to the SPPS and Policy QD 1 (a) of PPS 7- Quality Residential Environments, in that the development does not respect the surrounding context and topography of the site in terms of layout, siting, projection forward from the established building line, hard surfaced areas, retaining structures and landscaped areas.</p> <p>The proposal is contrary to the SPPS and Policy QD 1 (c) of PPS 7 – Quality Residential Environments, in that inadequate provision is made for private open space and landscaping.</p> <p>The proposal is contrary to the SPPS and Policy LC 1 (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 in terms of the overall impact on the existing street scene, the impact of ancillary works on the street scene and the excessive areas of hard surfaces and inadequate areas of amenity space.</p>			
Representations			
Objection Letters	Support Letters	Objection Petitions	Support Petitions
11	N/A	N/A	N/A
Consideration of Objections			
Issue	Consideration of Issue		
Insufficient space at end of cul-de-sac for site traffic during construction.	DFI Roads have considered the impact of the proposal and have no concerns in terms of road safety. Environmental Health are content and have not raised any issues relating to noise.		
Concerns over drainage/flooding	NI Water, Environmental Health and NIEA Water Management have not raised any concerns regarding drainage and the site does not lie within a floodplain.		

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

Week Ending 24th June 2022

Additional street traffic affecting children playing and road safety.	As above, DFI Roads have no concerns relating to access to the site, additional traffic or parking arrangements.
Reduction in the amount of natural light to current houses.	The proposal has been assessed in terms of overlooking, overshadowing and over-dominance. No issues will arise in relation to the loss of amenity of neighbouring properties.
Safety of existing bank bordering houses adjacent to where the proposed house will be built.	It is considered insufficient information has been submitted in relation to the structural stability of the bank along with the proposed retaining wall and the layout in general is unacceptable.
Environmental Impact of building work.	Environmental Health have not raised any objections relating to site construction
Site inappropriate due to proximity to neighbouring property due to potential safety issue of bank.	It is considered that the layout, siting, use of hard-surfaced areas, retaining structure and lack of landscaping/private amenity areas is unacceptable and does not respect the character of the area.
Loss of landscaped banked/green area.	Mature vegetation has been removed from the banked area however this has been considered in terms of the overall layout and the use of this area to site a dwelling is unacceptable.
Street is narrow and parking/turning already hindered.	As above, DFI Roads have no concerns from a traffic/road safety perspective

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

Week Ending 24th June 2022

Item Number 3			
Application Reference	LA05/2021/0774/F	Date Valid	14.07.2021
Description of Proposal	Proposed dwelling and garage	Location	Adjacent and east of 26 Steedstown Road Lisburn
Group Recommendation	Refusal	Case Officer	Cara Breen
Reasons for Recommendation			
<p>The proposal is contrary to the SPPS and Policies CTY1 and CTY10 of Planning Policy Statement 21, Sustainable Development in the Countryside and does not merit being considered as an exceptional case in that it has not been demonstrated that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • other dwelling(s)/development opportunities have not been sold off from the farm holding within 10 years of the date of the application; • the proposed new building is visually linked (or sited to cluster) with an established group of buildings on the farm and access to the dwelling is not obtained from an existing lane. • health and safety reasons exist to justify an alternative site not visually linked (or sited to cluster) with an established group of buildings on the farm • verifiable plans exist to expand the farm business at the existing building group(s) to justify an alternative site not visually linked (or sited to cluster) with an established group of buildings on the farm <p>The proposal is contrary to the SPPS and Policy CTY13 of Planning Policy Statement 21, Sustainable Development in the Countryside, in that the ancillary works do not integrate with their surroundings and the proposed dwelling is not visually linked or sited to cluster with an established group of buildings on the farm and therefore would not visually integrate into the surrounding landscape.</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 impact of ancillary works would damage rural character and would therefore result in a detrimental change to (further erode) the rural character of the countryside.</p>			
Representations			
Objection Letters	Support Letters	Objection Petitions	Support Petitions
1	N/A	1	N/A
Consideration of Objections			
Issue	Consideration of Issue		
Land ownership	A P2 challenge was carried out and an amended ownership certificate received.		
The applicant has admitted they are not a farmer	Planning permission goes with the land to which it relates. In this case the farmer, who has been served notice on, has given over his DARD details		

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

Week Ending 24th June 2022

	for the application to be made on his land. The granting of permission does not confer title.
An opportunity has been sold off within the last 10 years	This is reflected in the refusal reason that, at the time of submission there had been an opportunity sold off within the last 10 year period.
The proposal does not cluster with existing buildings on the farm	This is reflected within the refusal reason that confirms that the application is contrary to policy CTY10 part (c)
The proposal contrary to all criteria of CTY13 Design and Integration of Buildings in the Countryside	The objector has stated that the proposal fails all grounds of policy CTY13 however after a full assessment, the Planning Unit would agree that the proposal fails only to cluster with existing buildings on the farm and that the proposed new long laneway is unacceptable in terms of the ancillary works. In terms of prominence, it is considered that the distance away from the road, along with the existing and proposed boundary planting are sufficient that a refusal on this could not be sustained coupled with the pattern of other buildings in the area. The design of the proposed dwelling is simple rural form, render finish, pitched roof and vertical emphasis windows and also considered on balance to be acceptable with the context of only long distance views.
The proposal contrary to all criteria of CTY14 Rural Character by prominence	The objector has stated that the proposal fails all grounds of policy CTY14 however after a full assessment, the Planning Unit would agree that the ancillary works proposed by virtue of the long lane would potentially damage rural character. Assessment against prominence has been found to be acceptable on balance as has pattern of development, ribbon development given that it's not a roadside location and build up.