

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

Week Ending 2nd December 2022

Item Number 1			
Application Reference	LA05/2022/0803/F	Date Valid	01.09.2022
Description of Proposal	Small scale demolition on ground floor to remove small section at rear of building. Parts of rear wall removed to facilitate extension. 2 storey extension built to rear of house; works to include open plan living, new utility room, and new toilet on ground floor and a larger bathroom upstairs. Some internal walls modified for better circulation inside	Location	25 Causeway End Road Lisburn
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
1	N/A	N/A	N/A
Consideration of Objections			
Issue	Consideration of Issue		
No details regarding the actual size of the extension.	Existing and proposed floor plans and elevations have been submitted and are to scale therefore the size and dimensions are known.		
Confirmation needed that the extension is not encroaching onto the boundary line between the properties and that the boundary wall will remain in place.	The extension is shown to include a gap between the new build and the party boundary. The extension does not appear to encroach onto the boundary line as identified on plan and the boundary wall will not be affected and is still shown as remaining on the proposed rear elevation.		
2 storey extension will look out of place.	The two storey element of the extension is to the rear only and will not be visible from the front. The front elevation will remain unchanged as the extension will not come above the existing ridge line.		

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

Week Ending 2nd December 2022

<p>Location of the proposed kitchen will result in fire safety concerns and noise concerns.</p>	<p>The reconfiguration of the internal layout does not require planning permission and as such the kitchen can be relocated without permission. The concern regarding fire safety is for building control which is a separate permission.</p>
---	---

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

Week Ending 2nd December 2022

Item Number 2			
Application Reference	LA05/2022/0461/F	Date Valid	09.05.2022
Description of Proposal	Partial first floor extension to an existing single storey dwelling to create a new bedroom and ensuite. Single storey extension to the side and rear with roof terrace above	Location	11 Prospect Park Lisburn
Group Recommendation	Approval	Case Officer	Jonathan Marley
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		
Overshadowing of solar panels – up to 40% loss of solar generation in the mornings.	The scale and height of the works (flat roof) coupled with the orientation of the dwellings which are south facing and the pitch of the objector's roof will result in no overshadowing to an unreasonable degree in this urban area. It is noted that the adjacent property also has a pending application for a 7m single extension in. Whilst the applicants claim relate specifically to their solar panels, policy is designed to protect amenity space and light to rooms.		
Loss of privacy/overlooking.	Opaque screening to the sides of the balcony/terrace ensures the privacy of the neighbours will be protected. There will be no direct, uninterrupted views to the neighbours' private rear amenity space. The screening will be subject to a condition.		
Noise	Excessive residential noise is a matter for environmental health. The terrace is modest in size and has no roof. It utilises the space provided by the flat roof of the ground floor extension. Access to it is from a corridor off the master bedroom. It is therefore most likely to be utilised only in sunny weather by a maximum of 2 people in the mornings or late evenings and therefore the chance of excessive noise is considered low.		

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

Week Ending 2nd December 2022

Item Number 3			
Application Reference	LA05/2021/0560/F	Date Valid	19.05.2021
Description of Proposal	Proposed infill dwelling and detached garage	Location	Adjacent to and west of 4 Lairds Road Hillsborough
Group Recommendation	Approval	Case Officer	Cara Breen
Reasons for Recommendation			
All relevant planning material considerations have been satisfied.			
Representations			
Objection Letters	Support Letters	Objection Petitions	Support Petitions
5	N/A	N/A	N/A
Consideration of Objections			
Issue	Consideration of Issue		
Proposal would cause overshadowing to No. 4 Lairds Road due to height of proposed dwelling.	It is acknowledged that No. 4 Lairds Road is orientated away from the application site. The rear return of the proposed dwelling is lower in ridge height in comparison to the highest part of the rear return of the viable 'fall back' position of S/2013/0641/F. Following concerns raised, the agent provided sun/shadow study drawings for consideration. A 45 degree light test has also been conducted by the Council, to which it is noted that the proposal complies with. Taking the above into account, it is not perceived that the proposal would cause overshadowing to No. 4 Lairds Road to an unreasonable degree.		
Increased ground levels/infilling.	It was apparent from the site inspection that ground engineering works, primarily in the form of excavation to the rear of the site, had taken place on site as part of the commencement of S/2013/0641/F. It is however noted from the submitted plans that the proposed scheme primarily intends on reducing existing ground levels. Any works beyond this is a matter for enforcement.		
Size of proposed dwelling out of character with the traditional styles of housing in the area.	Whilst it is acknowledged that the proposed dwelling is larger than what is generally typical of the area, the difference between it and what could be constructed under the legally viable 'fall back' position is considered to be minimal. It is contended that the views from critical viewpoints would be inappreciable. It is considered that the proposed dwelling from the front (principle view) would be typical of that found in the rural locality.		