

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

**Week Ending 06 April 2023**

Item Number 1			
<b>Application Reference</b>	LA05/2022/0272/F	<b>Date Valid</b>	10.03.2022
<b>Description of Proposal</b>	Proposed 2no. detached dwellings with provision for future garages	<b>Location</b>	Gap between 42 Halfpenny Gate Road, Moira and Broomhedge Gospel Hall, 40a Halfpenny Gate Road, Moira
<b>Group Recommendation</b>	Refusal	<b>Case Officer</b>	Sinead McCloskey
Reasons for Recommendation			
<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 Policies CTY1 and CTY8 of Planning Policy Statement 21, Sustainable Development in the Countryside, in that the site is not considered to be a small gap in an otherwise substantial and continuously built up frontage and as a result the proposal will create a ribbon of development along Halfpenny Gate Road.</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 proposal lacks long established natural boundaries, it relies primarily on the use of new landscaping for integration and is a prominent feature in the 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 proposal would, if permitted be prominent in the landscape, create a sub-urban style build-up of development and add to a ribbon of development along Halfpenny Gate Road and would therefore result in a detrimental change to the rural character of the countryside.</p> <p>The proposal is contrary to the SPPS and Policy CTY15 of Planning Policy Statement 21, Sustainable Development in the Countryside in that the development would if permitted mar the distinction between the defined Settlement Limit of Halfpenny Gate and the surrounding countryside</p>			
Representations			
<b>Objection Letters</b>	<b>Support Letters</b>	<b>Objection Petitions</b>	<b>Support Petitions</b>
1	N/A	N/A	N/A
Consideration of Objections			
<b>Issue</b>	<b>Consideration of Issue</b>		
There has been a prior refusal on the site (LA05/2017/0868/O)	The planning history is acknowledged and there has been no change in the policy context since the previous decision was refused. There has however been a community hall approved which is also considered.		

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

**Week Ending 06 April 2023**

<p>Urban Sprawl between the communities of Broomhedge and Halfpenny Gate and ribbon development.</p>	<p>The assessment of this application above demonstrates that the proposed scheme is contrary to Policy CTY 8 and the SPPS in that it is contended that the proposed scheme does not fulfil the exceptions test for infill development as outlined in Policy CTY 8 of Planning Policy Statement 21: Sustainable Development in the Countryside and that two dwellings on the application site would result in the addition to ribbon development along this part of Halfpenny Gate Road. The site is not considered to be within a substantial and built up frontage as the dwelling at No.42 does not occupy a rural context as it is within the settlement limits of Halfpenny Gate. The proposal is also contrary to Policy CTY15 in the same policy document, as approval of this site for two dwellings would cause coalescence of both settlements by eroding the visual break and would mar the distinction between the settlement and the countryside resulting in urban sprawl.</p>
<p>Rural context and character rural if approved would allow urbanisation of a rural area, create ribbon development and destroy the rural character of area.</p>	<p>The assessment of this application above demonstrates that the proposed scheme is contrary to Policy CTY 8 and the SPPS in that it is contended that the proposed scheme does not fulfil the exceptions test for infill development as outlined in Policy CTY 8 of Planning Policy Statement 21: Sustainable Development in the Countryside and that two dwellings on the application site would result in the addition to ribbon development along this part of Halfpenny Gate Road. The site is not considered to be within a substantial and built up frontage as the dwelling at No.42 does not occupy a rural context as it is within the settlement limits of Halfpenny Gate. The proposal is also contrary to Policy CTY15 in the same policy document, as approval of this site for two dwellings would cause coalescence of both settlements by eroding the visual break and would mar the distinction between the settlement and the countryside resulting in urban sprawl.</p>

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

**Week Ending 06 April 2023**

<b>Item Number 2</b>			
<b>Application Reference</b>	LA05/2022/1068/F	<b>Date Valid</b>	14.11.2023
<b>Description of Proposal</b>	Proposed 2no first floor bedroom and en-suite extension over existing ground floor garage	<b>Location</b>	45 Castle Avenue, Moira
<b>Group Recommendation</b>	Approval	<b>Case Officer</b>	Joanna Magee
<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>
1	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>Consideration of Objections</b>			
<b>Issue</b>	<b>Consideration of Issue</b>		
Concerns regarding loss of sunlight.	The properties residing at Little Wenham Moira will receive adequate sunlight from a south/south-westerly direction. The proposal has been reduced in height to reduce the impact upon residents.		
Dominance.	The proposal is for a two storey side extension which is similar to what has already been carried out within the surrounding area. The agent was asked to reduce the height of the two storey extension which has now been received and considered acceptable.		
Single storey extension suggested rather than two storey.	The property contains an existing single storey rear extension already and the proposal under consideration is for a 2 <sup>nd</sup> floor extension.		