

#### Week Ending 21st November 2025

Item Number 1						
Application Reference	LA05/2025/0514/F	Date Valid	16.07.2025			
Description of Proposal	Variation of condition 3 of planning approval LA05/2021/0597/O from: A plan at 1:500 scale (min.) shall be submitted as part of the reserved matters application showing the access to be constructed in accordance with the attached form RS1. Reason: To ensure there is a satisfactory means of access in the interests of road safety and the convenience of road users. To A plan at 1:500 scale (min.) shall be submitted as part of the reserved matters application showing the access to be constructed in accordance with drawing no. 2212 001. Reason: To ensure there is a satisfactory means of access in the interests of road safety and the convenience of road users	Location	Lands to rear of 51 and 53 Drumlough Road, Royal Hillsborough			
Group Recommendation	Approval	Case Officer	Catherine Gray			
Reasons for Recommendation						
All relevant planning material considerations have been satisfied.						
Representations						
Objection Letters	Support Letters	Objection Pe				
6	N/A	N/A	N/A			
Consideration of Objections						



## Week Ending 21st November 2025

Issue	Consideration of Issue
Disagreement with	The view is expressed that although Dfl Roads have no objections, it is
Dfl Roads.	the objector's opinion that the proposal is contrary to the requirements of the Departments published guidance.
	Dfl Roads have been consulted on the proposal and have no objections. Dfl Roads are the competent authority on road safety issues. Taking on board the advice from Dfl Roads, the Planning Unit is satisfied that the variation of condition would create a safe access and not prejudice road safety or significantly inconvenience the flow of vehicles and complies with policy TRA2 of the Plan Strategy.
Ownership of land.	The view is expressed that Certificate A has been filled in stating that the applicants are in possession of every part of the land to which the application relates. However, the objector states that this is incorrect. And he quotes that it states in 'policy statement 15 clause 1.4 states that it is not the departments policy to grant planning permission for a development involving the creation of an access and/or visibility splays unless the applicant is able to demonstrate control or the reasonable prospect of obtaining control of any land likely to be the subject of a condition relating to the provision of any access and/or visibility splays.' The view is expressed that the applicant is not in possession of the land encompassing the western site line fronting 53 Drumlough Road as this is in the ownership of the objector and his wife and that the applicant will not be getting possession of it. And that to the objector's knowledge that the applicant neither has possession of the land containing the site line to the East. Land ownership is a legal matter between the relevant parties. The onus is on the applicant/developer to ensure that they have ownership/control of all lands necessary to implement a planning approval. The reference to policy statement 15 is incorrect as planning policy statement 15 is a superseded planning policy that deals with flooding. Presumably the objector is referring to Development Control Advice Note 15 Vehicular Access Standards. DCAN 15 is guidance taken on board when assessing an application and not policy.
Wording on the plans with regards to access and visibility splays.	Concerns are expressed that the site layout drawing proposes that access alterations and visibility splays are required to be completed before the development is occupied. The objector asks for this to be a pre-commencement condition and for the access to be put in prior to works commencing. And the view is expressed that the notations regarding the hedging and wall is not included in on the plans. It is stated that it is unclear if the boundary wall of the neighbouring property would need any adjustment or relocation of the wall would be necessary.
	This application relates solely to the variation of the wording of condition 3 of LA05/2021/0597/O. The submitted drawing clearly states that the area within the visibility splays shall be cleared to provide a level surface no higher than 250mm above the level of the adjoining carriageway prior to the commencement of works. The plans clearly detail that the visibility



### Week Ending 21st November 2025

	splays are forward of the neighbour's wall and pillars and should not interfere with these.	
Notification of the application and lack of neighbour notification.	The objector expresses the view that he has not been notified regarding this application and that it is his understanding that all occupiers of all buildings on land adjoining the application site boundary and also within 90m of the application site should be notified by the applicant at least 21 days prior to the submission of an application and that he should have been notified. Another objector expresses concerns about lack of neighbour notification.	
	If there are land ownership issues between the applicant and the objector, this is a legal issue between the relevant parties. The Council has fulfilled its statutory obligations with regards to neighbour notification during the processing of the application.	
Two applications on the same site.	The view is expressed that there would appear to be now two planning applications in for the same lands, by two different agents, for the same applicant, and the question is asked are both these applications still live and being assessed.	
	There are two applications on this application site, and both are valid applications being processed by the Council.	
Comments relating to application LA05/2024/0736/F.	The objector raises concerns and comments in relation to application LA05/2024/0736/F.	
	The comments in relation to application LA05/2024/0736/F will be assessed under application LA05/2024/0736/F.	



#### Week Ending 21st November 2025

Item Number 2			
Application Reference	LA05/2023/0833/F	Date Valid	18.10.2023
Description of Proposal	Conversion and single storey extension to listed building for self-catering accommodation. Demolition of existing outbuilding on site.	Location	19 Lisleen Road, Newtownards
Group	Refusal	Case	Kevin Maguire
Recommendation		Officer	-

#### **Reasons for Recommendation**

The proposal is contrary to Policy COU1 of the Lisburn and Castlereagh City Council Plan Strategy in that the proposed development is not a type of development which in principle is acceptable in the countryside.

The proposal is contrary to Policy TOU4 of the Lisburn and Castlereagh City Council Plan Strategy in that the proposal does not comply with Criteria a) in that the proposed accommodation is not located within the grounds of an existing or approved tourist accommodation or holiday park.

# | Consideration of Objection of Issue | Consideration of Issue | Consid