

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

**Week Ending 27th May 2022**

<b>Item Number 1</b>			
<b>Application Reference</b>	LA05/2021/0866/F	<b>Date Valid</b>	09.08.2021
<b>Description of Proposal</b>	Erection of agricultural buildings, one shed for sheep birthing pens and one general purpose agricultural shed for storage of fodder and farm machinery.	<b>Location</b>	300m south west of no 50 Taughblane Road, Hillsborough.
<b>Group Recommendation</b>	Refusal	<b>Case Officer</b>	Richard McMullan
<b>Reasons for Recommendation</b>			
<p>The proposal is contrary to the SPPS and Policy CTY12 of Planning Policy Statement 21, Sustainable Development in the Countryside in that it has not been demonstrated that the site is located within an agricultural (or forestry holding) that is currently active and established or that it is necessary for the efficient use of the active and established agricultural (or forestry) holding.</p> <p>The proposal is contrary to the SPPS and Policy CTY12 of Planning Policy Statement 21 Sustainable Development in the Countryside, in that insufficient information has been given to demonstrate that there are no suitable existing buildings on the holding or enterprise that can be used and that the proposal is sited beside existing farm or forestry buildings.</p> <p>The proposal is contrary to the SPPS and policy CTY12 of Planning Policy Statement 21 Sustainable Development in the Countryside, in that it has not been demonstrated that there are no alternative sites available at another group of buildings on the holding and that health and safety reasons exist to justify an alternative site away from the existing farm (or forestry) buildings or that the alternative site away is essential for the efficient functioning of the business.</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 development would, if permitted result in a suburban style build-up of development when viewed with existing and approved buildings and it would, if permitted not respect the traditional pattern of settlement exhibited in that area 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 27th May 2022**

<b>Item Number 2</b>			
<b>Application Reference</b>	LA05/2021/0209/F	<b>Date Valid</b>	23.02.2021
<b>Description of Proposal</b>	New dwelling	<b>Location</b>	adjacent to 11 Seymour Park Lisburn
<b>Group Recommendation</b>	Refusal	<b>Case Officer</b>	Brenda Ferguson
<b>Reasons for Recommendation</b>			
<p>The proposal is contrary to the SPPS and Policy QD1 (a) of Planning Policy Statement 7: "Quality Residential Environments" in that the proposed development fails to respect the surrounding context and if approved, 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 (c) of Planning Policy Statement 7: "Quality Residential Environments" in that inadequate and inappropriate provision has been made for private amenity space.</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>			
<b>Representations</b>			
<b>Objection Letters</b>	<b>Support Letters</b>	<b>Objection Petitions</b>	<b>Support Petitions</b>
10	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>Consideration of Objections</b>			
<b>Issue</b>	<b>Consideration of Issue</b>		
Overdevelopment of the site.	As demonstrated by the refusal reasons and recommendation it is agreed that the fragmentation and sub-division of number 11 and its associated curtilage would result in overdevelopment of the site as a dwelling on the site would appear cramped and manufactured in the street scene.		
Proposal is out of character with other properties in the area which are bungalows.	As demonstrated by the refusal reasons and recommendation it is contended that the proposal is out of character with the other properties in terms of the pattern of development and layout arrangement.		
Upper floor level out of keeping with the scale and character of	The proposed dwelling is single storey with roof space accommodation however with velux windows only.		

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

**Week Ending 27th May 2022**

surrounding dwellings.	
Loss of privacy – overlooking into bedroom at rear of number 11.	The dwelling is approximately 8m from the rear boundary of number 11 and 12m from the rear of the property. With the height as proposed, and velux windows only at roof space level, no overlooking or loss of privacy will occur into the neighbouring property.
Lack of designated parking and loss of visitor spaces for number 11.	The proposed revised site layout map indicates 2 no. in-curtilage parking spaces. DFI Roads have commented with no objections to the proposed parking arrangements.
Lack of clarification on dimensions, positions, boundaries, requested movements of street furniture etc.	Relocation of telegraph poles and lamp posts have been shown on the revised proposed site layout map however boundaries have not been identified on the latest plan. No dimensions are shown on the latest plan. It is considered there is sufficient information to make an assessment.
Additional traffic arising from development.	DFI Roads are satisfied with the proposed dwelling in line with PPS 3 – Access, Movement and Parking and have raised no concerns in relation to road safety and traffic movements.
Sight lines unsafe and unsatisfactory.	DFI Roads are content with sight lines as shown on the latest revised site layout map.
Extensions forward of the established building line.	The dwelling appears to come forward marginally from the building line at number 11 however this in itself, is not considered to be detrimental to the character.
Position of dwelling now adjacent to and facing industrial buildings – obverse with existing build and garden lines.	It is agreed that the repositioning of the dwelling which will now directly face an industrial building which will not result in a quality residential layout. This is reflected within the refusal reasons recommended.
Removal/relocation of street lamp/telegraph pole for required sight lines.	DFI Roads are content with the relocation of the street lamp, telegraph poles and proposed sight lines.
Parking/turning now made difficult	As above, DFI Roads are content with the proposed access, parking and turning arrangements as shown on the latest revised site layout map dated 6 <sup>th</sup> September 2021.

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

**Week Ending 27th May 2022**

at dead end cul-de-sac.	
Plan does not show existing trees and new planting proposed outside of red line.	The latest site layout map does not indicate existing and planting arrangements however this has been clarified on an earlier site layout map.