

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

**Week Ending 28 January 2022**

<b>Item Number 1</b>			
<b>Application Reference</b>	LA05/2021/1178/F	<b>Date Valid</b>	26.10.2021
<b>Description of Proposal</b>	Erection of a dwelling house in compliance with PPS21 CTY8 (Infill)	<b>Location</b>	North and adjacent to 32 Killynure Road West, Killynure, Carryduff, BT8 8EA
<b>Group Recommendation</b>	Refusal	<b>Case Officer</b>	Richard Mc Mullan
<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 CTY13 of Planning Policy Statement 21, Sustainable Development in the Countryside, in that the design of the proposed development is inappropriate for the site and its locality and therefore would not visually integrate into the surrounding landscape.</p> <p>The proposal is contrary to Section 3 of the Planning (General Development Procedure) Order (Northern Ireland) 2015 in that insufficient information has been submitted to enable the full assessment of the proposed development in respect of proposed ground works. Details in respect of existing and proposed ground levels throughout the site, as requested to be submitted by the Council has not been made available for consideration.</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 28 January 2022**

<b>Item Number 2</b>			
<b>Application Reference</b>	LA05/2018/0557/F	<b>Date Valid</b>	07.06.2018
<b>Description of Proposal</b>	Retrospective application for workshop extension to the rear of existing building	<b>Location</b>	56 Moneyreagh Road, Newtownards, BT23 6BJ
<b>Group Recommendation</b>	Refusal	<b>Case Officer</b>	Joseph Billham
<b>Reasons for Recommendation</b>			
<p>The proposal is contrary to SPPS and Policy AMP 2 of PPS 3 – Access Movement and Parking in that, it has not been demonstrated that the access will not prejudice road safety or significantly inconvenience the flow of traffic.</p> <p>The proposal is contrary to SPPS and Policy PED 9 of PPS 4 – General Criteria for Economic Development Criteria G and H in that, it has not been demonstrated that the existing road network can safely handle any extra vehicular traffic and that adequate access arrangements have been provided.</p>			
<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>		
Working outside of business hours	Environmental Health have been consulted on the application and offered no objections. Environmental Health have provided relevant opening hours for the business		
Validity of application built without permission and explain why both applications not included in one application	The application has been applied retrospectively for the extension to the workshop and is considered a valid application which the Council are obliged to determine as submitted		
Privacy from our home	It is considered the extension to the workshop will have no greater impact on privacy than that of the existing business on site. The existing hedging on site is to be retained		
Car parking not mentioned on application	This application is dealing with the extension to the existing workshop only. The car parking has been identified on drawing 03B date stamped 03 Feb 2020. There is a separate application ref: LA05/2018/0793/F addressing the extension of curtilage and parking		

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

**Week Ending 28 January 2022**

Impact of noise and on quality of home life	Environmental Health have been consulted on the application regarding noise and amenity and offered no objections
Instability of land bank between site and adjoin neighbour	The stability of the neighbouring is out the remit of planning control and is the responsibility of the developer to ensure that all neighbouring properties are not negatively impacted.
Value of Home	No information has been provided in relation to the impact on house value that can be given determined weight
Unightly view	This is not a planning material consideration which can be given weight
Justified need for extension and repurposing of land	Concerns has been raised for the need of the extension to the business and repurposing of land. Planning policy makes provision for extension to businesses in the countryside under certain criteria. This proposal has been assessed under the relevant planning policies
Disregard of planning and building control regulations	This application has been applied for retrospectively and is considered a valid application. Any unauthorized development will be referred to the Planning Enforcement Team. Building Control Regulation is outside the remit of the Planning Department

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

**Week Ending 28 January 2022**

<b>Item Number 3</b>			
<b>Application Reference</b>	LA05/2018/0793/F	<b>Date Valid</b>	26.07.2018
<b>Description of Proposal</b>	Retrospective (Extension to curtilage) to provide additional parking and turning area for the sales and repair of vehicles (amended P1 page and amended plan)	<b>Location</b>	56 Moneyreagh Road, Moneyreagh, Newtownards, BT23 6BJ
<b>Group Recommendation</b>	Refusal	<b>Case Officer</b>	Catherine Gray
<b>Reasons for Recommendation</b>			
<p>The proposal is contrary to paragraph 4.12 of the SPPS in that insufficient information in respect of sewerage and drainage has been provided to enable the Council to make an informed decision in relation to potential impacts on the environment.</p> <p>The proposal is contrary to Policy PED 9 of Planning Policy Statement 4 Planning and Economic Development in that it has not been demonstrated that the proposal is capable of dealing satisfactorily with any emission or effluent.</p>			
<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>		
Disregard for planning and building regulations	<p>Concern has been raised that the land has been developed without planning permission and that there is a disregard for planning and building regulations. They have concerns about the re-purposing of the land.</p> <p>The application been submitted as a retrospective application and any unauthorised development has been referred to enforcement.</p>		
Application LA05/2018/0793/F and LA05/2018/0557/F are not included in one application	<p>The objector asks the question why LA05/2018/0793/F and LA05/2018/0557/F are not included in one application. The Council considers both applications to be valid and is obliged to determine the applications as submitted</p>		
Visual Impact	Concerns about been raised about the visual impact of the proposal.		

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

**Week Ending 28 January 2022**

	The proposal is to the rear of the site and has limited public viewpoints. Existing surrounding vegetation is to be retained which aids with the proposals integration. It is considered that the proposal would not have a negative visual impact.
Noise Impact	Concerns have been raised about the noise impact of the proposal. The proposal is to extend the yard area for the parking and turning of vehicles associated with the existing business. Environmental Health have no objection to the proposal subject to condition that the area shall not be used for the repair of vehicles. A condition to this effect is recommended if the proposal is to be approved
Effect on quality of home life	Concern has been raised that the proposal would have a negative effect on the quality of home life of the neighbouring property. It is considered that the proposal would not harm the amenity of the neighbouring residents or have an unacceptable effect on their quality of home life. The proposal is for the extension of curtilage for the parking and turning of vehicles only. Environmental Health have no objection to the proposal subject to condition that the area shall not be used for the repair of vehicles
Instability of the bank between the site and neighbours property	Concern has been raised about the stability of the bank of land between the application site and the neighbour's property. The stability of the site is out with the remit of planning and it is the responsibility of the developer to ensure that neighbouring properties are not negatively impacted
Effect on value of neighbouring property	Concern has been raised that the proposal would have a negative impact on the value of the neighbouring property. Property value is not a material consideration that can be given determining weight.
Need for the extension to the business	Concern has been raised about the need for the extension to the business and the re-purposing of the land. And there are concerns that it could become a scrapyard. Planning policy makes provision for extensions to businesses in the countryside under certain criteria. This proposal has been assessed against the relevant planning policy. The application is for the extension to the yard area for the parking of vehicles and not for a scrapyard

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

**Week Ending 28 January 2022**

<b>Item Number 4</b>			
<b>Application Reference</b>	LA05/2020/0630/O	<b>Date Valid</b>	18.08.2020
<b>Description of Proposal</b>	Outline application for football pitch, associated ancillary accommodation, storage, parking, access and planting(amended description)	<b>Location</b>	Lands adjacent to 120 Ballynahinch Road, Hillsborough
<b>Group Recommendation</b>	Approval	<b>Case Officer</b>	Maire Claire O'Neill
<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>
5	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>Consideration of Objections</b>			
<b>Issue</b>	<b>Consideration of Issue</b>		
Proposal is contrary to CTY 1 from PPS 21	A supporting statement identifying how the proposed development complied with the relevant polices was requested from the agent and information was submitted in November 2021 and December 2021 detailing how the proposal meets the relevant policy tests. The neighbours and objectors were re-notified on 13 January advising them of the receipt of this information		
The proposal should be assessed against policy OS 4 from PPS 8 and not Policy OS3.	The application has been assessed using the correct policy context. Policy OS 4 is not considered to be relevant as the proposal is for 1 no. football pitch as opposed to a stadium or other intensive sports facility		
Details of floodlighting have not been submitted	As this is an outline application, full drawings and details are not required at this stage. This application seeks to determine if the principle of a football pitch at this location is acceptable. At the Reserved Matters stage, a full suite of detailed drawings, details of floodlighting will be required to be submitted for assessment.		
Lack of detail in general submitted with the application	As stated earlier, this is an outline application so the information required is limited. The agent was contacted to provide additional supporting information which was submitted in November and December 2021		

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

**Week Ending 28 January 2022**

<b>Item Number 5</b>			
<b>Application Reference</b>	LA05/2018/0216/F	<b>Date Valid</b>	02.03.2018
<b>Description of Proposal</b>	Amendments to previous approval LA05/2016/0682/F for development of a tourism/conference facility, including an accommodation & separate conference block with ancillary spaces such as kitchen toilets, circulation & office	<b>Location</b>	Adjacent to 120 Ballynahinch Road, Hillsborough
<b>Group Recommendation</b>	Approval	<b>Case Officer</b>	Maire Claire O'Neill
<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>
10	10	N/A	N/A
<b>Consideration of Objections</b>			
<b>Issue</b>	<b>Consideration of Issue</b>		
No justification for proposal in countryside location.	A detailed supporting statement was supplied with the application as detailed in the main body of this report. It clearly demonstrated justification for this development in this location		
In appropriate in size and intrusive in countryside	The proposed development is not considered to be intrusive or inappropriate in this location. It is of a similar height to the adjacent dwellings and agricultural buildings and respects the character and design of many buildings in the area. The proposed finishes of render and stone are appropriate in the countryside location		
Strain on infrastructure such as sewage	The statutory consultees such as NI Water and NIEA have assessed the proposal and are content that it is satisfactory and that the infrastructure is capable of dealing with the proposed development.		
Foraging bats are in the locality	No buildings have been demolished as part of the proposal which would have had roosting potential for bats. The information submitted does not indicate that the proposal will have a negative impact on any natural heritage features		

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

**Week Ending 28 January 2022**

<p>Newts are frogs are present in the adjacent stream</p>	<p>The information submitted does not indicate that the proposal will have a negative impact on any natural heritage features including harm to the habitats of newts.</p>
<p>Previous approval was flawed and not properly assessed.</p>	<p>The detail and assessment of the 2016 application is captured on the professional case officer's report. It is considered that a proper and robust assessment was carried out as part of the processing of that application</p>
<p>No sequential test</p>	<p>A sequential test was submitted as part of the submission and the information has been considered and found to be acceptable</p>
<p>No drainage assessment submitted and site has history of flooding</p>	<p>A drainage assessment was submitted and the detail contained within it was forwarded to DFI Rivers who have offered no objection to assessment and findings contained within it. No history of flooding has been recorded.</p>