

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

Week Ending 4th March 2022

Item Number 1			
Application Reference	LA05/2019/0701/F	Date Valid	05.07.2019
Description of Proposal	Proposed residential development of 26 dwellings comprising 20 semi-detached and 6 detached houses including garages, open space, landscaping and associated works (amended description)	Location	Land adjacent to 9 Bridge Cottages, Moybrick Road, Dromara
Group Recommendation	Approval	Case Officer	Sinead Mc Closkey
Reasons for Recommendation			
All relevant planning material considerations have been satisfied.			
Representations			
Objection Letters	Support Letters	Objection Petitions	Support Petitions
2	N/A	N/A	N/A
Consideration of Objections			
Issue	Consideration of Issue		
The proposal will have an effect on elderly residents in area.	The proposal has been assessed against the provisions of PPS 7 and is found to comply with the policies therein and will not cause any adverse effects to any adjacent properties.		
Environmental and traffic impact.	The Natural Environment Division were consulted with Preliminary Ecological Assessment. They had no concerns and recommended conditions to be attached to an approval. DFI Roads were also consulted and had no objections.		
It will change the character of area.	The proposal has been assessed against Policy LC1 and was found not to offend the character of the area.		
It will impact on their view.	There is no policy consideration to assess how a development proposal may affect a view.		
The housing will destroy what makes Dromara desirable to live in.	Much of the site has been zoned for housing and as such there is an expectation that there will be additional housing provision in Dromara.		

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

Week Ending 4th March 2022

<p>The proposal will remove green space and impact on the wildlife and peace and quiet of the countryside.</p>	<p>The site is mostly zoned for housing and as such has been earmarked for development. Most of the site is within the development limits of Dromara and not in the countryside. Only a small portion of the land outside of the development limit will be developed.</p>
<p>The road is not suitable for more vehicles.</p>	<p>DFI Roads were consulted with the development proposals and had no concerns with additional traffic in this area.</p>

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

Week Ending 4th March 2022

Item Number 2			
Application Reference	LA05/2021/0203/F	Date Valid	22.02.2021
Description of Proposal	Proposed dwelling and garage	Location	Adjacent to 50a Crumlin Road, Upper Ballinderry, BT28 2JZ
Group Recommendation	Refusal	Case Officer	Cara Breen
Reasons for Recommendation			
<p>The proposal is contrary to the Strategic Planning Policy Statement (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 Strategic Planning Policy Statement (SPPS) and Policy CTY 8 of Planning Policy Statement 21: Sustainable Development in the Countryside, in that the application site is an important visual break and it is not located within a small gap in an otherwise substantial and continuously built up frontage which respects the existing development pattern along the frontage and which meets other planning and environmental requirements and if permitted would add to a ribbon of development along Crumlin Road.</p> <p>The proposal is contrary to the Strategic Planning Policy Statement (SPPS) and Policy CTY 14 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 buildings, would not respect the traditional pattern of settlement exhibited in the area and would add to a ribbon of development along Crumlin Road.</p>			
Representations			
Objection Letters	Support Letters	Objection Petitions	Support Petitions
0	N/A	N/A	N/A
Consideration of Objections			
Issue	Consideration of Issue		

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

Week Ending 4th March 2022

Item Number 3			
Application Reference	LA05/2020/0013/F	Date Valid	08.01.2020
Description of Proposal	1no single storey 2 bedroom dwelling in the side garden of no 9 Woodland Drive with new access from Woodland Drive	Location	9 Woodland Drive, Derrriaghy, Lisburn, BT27 4PH
Group Recommendation	Refusal	Case Officer	Brenda Ferguson
Reasons for Recommendation			
<p>The proposal is contrary to the SPPS and Policy QD1 (a) of the Departments Planning Policy Statement 7: Quality Residential Environments in that the development does not respect the surrounding context and is inappropriate to the character of the site in terms of layout and projection forward of the established building line in Woodland Park.</p> <p>The proposal is contrary to the SPPS and Planning Policy Statement 7, Quality Residential Environments, Policy QD 1 (f), in that it has not been demonstrated that adequate and appropriate provision is made for parking within the site.</p> <p>The Proposal is contrary to the SPPS and Planning Policy Statement 3, Access, Movement and Parking, Policy AMP2, in that it would, if permitted, prejudice the safety and convenience of road users since it has not been demonstrated that the access width and visibility splays can be provided in accordance with the standards contained in the department's Development Control Advice Note 15.</p>			
Representations			
Objection Letters	Support Letters	Objection Petitions	Support Petitions
0	N/A	N/A	N/A
Consideration of Objections			
Issue	Consideration of Issue		

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

Week Ending 4th March 2022

Item Number 4			
Application Reference	LA05/2021/1039/F	Date Valid	24/09/2021
Description of Proposal	Single storey rear extension. New works to include a new family dining and utility room	Location	97 Ballylenaghan Park, BT8 6WR
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
3	2	N/A	N/A
Consideration of Objections			
Issue	Consideration of Issue		
Contrary to Policy EXT 1 (a) in that the proposal is not sympathetic to the existing property and surrounding area and is unacceptable in scale, massing etc.	The proposal is single storey and of a modest scale. It has a total footprint of approximately 27m ² . Cognisance is taken of the fallback position regarding permitted development. The materials are matching the existing dwelling. The flat roof aspect differs from the main dwelling but is not an unusual design feature for extensions. It is considered that , it helps reduce the potential impact of overshadowing/loss of light and dominating impact.		
Contrary to Policy EXT 1 (b) in that it would have an overbearing, dominant impact and result in loss of natural light and overshadowing. Level difference between the sites will exacerbate the impact and restrict visual amenity. The length height and proximity is unacceptable and	The proposal is of modest height (approx. 3m) and is set off the boundary (approximately 1m). There is a difference in ground levels of 0.5m however the proposed height is still considered acceptable given the existing boundary between the properties of a low level wall and a 2m fence on top totalling some 3m. Any potential impacts would not be into the private rear amenity area but the driveway of the neighbouring property. The only windows on this side elevation are a downstairs toilet and lobby/hall behind front door. The proposal, if approved, will not result in significant loss of light, overshadowing or an unacceptable level of dominance. The proposal if approved, will not set an unwanted precedent as (a) there have been other single storey rear extensions approved in the wider area already and (b) all applications have regard to the history of the site/wider area but they are also assessed against their own site specifics.		

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

Week Ending 4th March 2022

would set a precedent.	
Research of other extensions in the area are not comparable.	This application has had due regard to previous approvals for extensions and there are none directly comparable. The application is assessed on its own merits against prevailing planning policy.
It is stated that A7, A29, A31 and A32 of PPS7 Addendum are also relevant in this case. He suggests that an alternative to a long high wall, in close proximity to his front door should be considered.	In terms of A7, this section of policy relates mainly to side extensions, and this application is for a rear extension. It is not considered that the plot has been overdeveloped nor is it too close to the boundary. It is not significantly greater than what would be allowed under permitted development and the proposal is also set approximately 1m off the boundary. Section A29 mentions "reasonable space between buildings", but relates to privacy and overlooking. There are no overlooking issues from the proposal to the objectors property. Section A31 deals with dominance and the feeling of being "hemmed" in. The proposal is not considered to be excessively higher or longer, than the existing boundary treatment. It is also set approximately 1m off the boundary. Section A32 relates to overshadowing and loss of light. Given its modest size and orientation of the dwellings the proposal will not cause overshadowing loss of light to an unreasonable degree. It is not impacting on habitable rooms. In relation to the objectors request for an alternative to the long high wall the boundary treatment was considered acceptable and the Council must determine what is before them.