

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

Week Ending 7th March 2025

Item Number 1			
Application Reference	LA05/2023/0309/F	Date Valid	06.04.2023
Description of Proposal	Dwelling, garage and all associated site works (Change of house type in substitution to replacement dwelling approved under S/2009/1291/F (Retrospective))	Location	18 Kilcorig Road, Lisburn
Group Recommendation	Approval	Case Officer	Michael Vladeanu
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		
Commencement of works date.	<p>The objector is concerned that the application is wrong in that work commenced in January/February 2020 not 1/12/2022 as per retrospective Application Form.</p> <p>It has now been confirmed that the replacement dwelling (as approved under S/2009/1291/F) has been lawfully commenced within the specified time period as per approval LA05/2024/0755/CLUED.</p>		
Misleading description of original planning permission S/2009/1291/F.	<p>The objector is concerned that a games room is included on top of the garage, with full links to the main dwelling and so the original planning permission (S/2009/1291/F) of a mere 'attached garage' is/was inaccurate and misleading.</p> <p>The original planning permission S/2009/1291/F was approved by the Department of the Environment (DOE) who approved the application with the proposal description to read 'Replacement one and a half storey dwelling with attached garage to rear.' This application has already been determined and the description deemed acceptable. As such no material weight has been given to this statement.</p>		

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

Week Ending 7th March 2025

<p>Overlooking of neighboring properties.</p>	<p>The objector is concerned that the windows in the games room and links to the main house overlook surrounding properties, even more so being two storeys high.</p> <p>As per the approved plans of S/2009/1291/F the attached garage and games room was approved as a two-storey structure with a circular first floor window on the rear elevation. As per this application the games room is still two stories in height however, it is noted that the eaves height has been slightly enlarged to accommodate two new first floor windows. However, given that there are already two first floor windows on this elevation facing towards neighbour to the north and separation distance of approximately 40m, it is not considered that this alteration would give rise to a significant impact on neighbouring amenity over and above that already approved and commenced under S/2009/1291/F and as per approval LA05/2024/0755/CLUED.</p> <p>The development is in accordance with Criteria (f) of Policy COU16 of the Lisburn & Castlereagh Plan Strategy 2032.</p>
<p>Inappropriate massing of the dwelling.</p>	<p>The objector is concerned that the large frontage has been squeezed into a small plot and elongated to the rear</p> <p>The scale, footprint and massing of the dwelling would remain the same as that approved and deemed lawfully commenced under LA05/2024/0755/CLUED, and therefore it is considered that the dwelling fits into its plot and is in keeping with its surroundings.</p> <p>The development is in accordance with Criteria (a) and (f) of Policy COU15 and Criteria (a) and (e) of Policy COU16 of the Lisburn & Castlereagh Plan Strategy 2032.</p>
<p>Detached garage omitted from the plans.</p>	<p>The objector is concerned that the related double garage built to the north is incorrectly described as 'hard standing' on the plans/maps (except the Site Boundary)</p> <p>The garage was approved under a separate application (LA05/2015/0095/F), which remains extant and independent of the current application. The application only seeks to amend the previously approved house type and attached garage and does not propose any changes to the detached garage. As such, its omission does not affect the assessment of the proposal. The presence of the garage has already been deemed acceptable under its extant approval and does not form part of the assessment of this application.</p>
<p>Detrimental impact to the character and appearance of the area.</p>	<p>The objector is concerned that the house is not in-keeping with surrounding properties which are all bungalows with white render</p> <p>The height of the dwelling approved under S/2009/1291/F and lawfully commenced under LA05/2024/0755/CLUED thus was found to be</p>

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

Week Ending 7th March 2025

	<p>acceptable in this location. It is acknowledged that there are a number of existing two storey dwellings in the vicinity on Kilcorrig Road. Regarding the materials, whilst white render is the dominant material in the immediate area, properties along Kilcorrig Road exhibit a variety of finishes, including brick and stone. The proposed materials therefore reflect this diversity and help integrate the dwelling into its surrounding context.</p> <p>The development is in accordance with Criteria (f) of Policy COU15 and Criteria (c) and (e) of Policy COU16 of the Lisburn & Castlereagh Plan Strategy 2032.</p>
--	---

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

Week Ending 7th March 2025

Item Number 2			
Application Reference	LA05/2024/0115/F	Date Valid	09.02.2024
Description of Proposal	Addition of a 2-storey side and rear extension, single storey flat roofed extension and erection of storage shed	Location	28 Old Dundonald Road, Belfast
Group Recommendation	Approval	Case Officer	Joseph Billham
Reasons for Recommendation			
All relevant planning material considerations have been satisfied.			
Representations			
Objection Letters	Support Letters	Objection Petitions	Support Petitions
3	N/A	N/A	N/A
Consideration of Objections			
Issue	Consideration of Issue		
The view is expressed that the proposal will lead to impact on privacy and amenity to properties at Beechwood Manor.	The rear extension has a separation distance of 10.8m to the rear boundary and 30m building to building with No 17 Beechwood Manor. This is considered sufficient space between buildings in order to minimise overlooking and shall not lead to undue impact on privacy and amenity.		
No reference to existing garage on existing and proposed plans. Removal of garage would impact on privacy and amenity.	The garage has been indicated on the original plans submitted and is being retained. The proposal shall not have an undue impact on privacy and amenity.		

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

Week Ending 7th March 2025

Item Number 3			
Application Reference	LA05/2023/0096/RM	Date Valid	30.01.2023
Description of Proposal	Housing Development comprising 8 dwellings	Location	644 Saintfield Road Carryduff Down
Group Recommendation	Approval	Case Officer	Catherine Gray
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		
Overlooking/privacy.	<p>The view is expressed that the semi-detached houses (two houses, no's 2 and 3) are in close proximity to 1 Baronscourt Link and overlook the back garden with direct line of sight into the back living room, kitchen and garden. The view is also expressed that the height of the existing boundary fence ranges in height and provides limited privacy for both 1 Baronscourt Link and for house no'2 and 3. And that the orientation of house numbers 2 and 3 are straight on their property and directly look into their back garden, rear living room and kitchen.</p> <p>It is considered that adequate separation distances are provided between the proposed dwellings and neighbouring established properties in conjunction with level differences and in situ boundary treatments (with additional supplementary planting in any gaps) results in no significant concern with regards to potential undue overlooking. The proposal would not cause any unacceptable overlooking into private amenity space and the separation distances are in keeping with Creating Places. The orientation of the proposed dwellings is acceptable when assessed against the prevailing policy and guidance.</p>		
Misleading information/separation distances.	<p>The view is expressed that the application is misleading in stating a distance of 23m between house no. 2 and 1 Baronscourt Link as it measures the distance to the kitchen rather than the rear living room. The view is expressed that this is the occupants main living space and that the distance from the rear living room to house number 2 is insufficient.</p>		

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

Week Ending 7th March 2025

	<p>The submitted plans are to scale and all distances between existing and proposed properties are considered. The measurements stated on the plans are considered to be measured correctly. The proposed separation distances are in keeping with Creating Places.</p>
Boundary planting/fence.	<p>The view is expressed that the existing boundary planting and proposed additional trees are primarily deciduous providing insufficient screening for the majority of the year. In addition, along a major section of the boundary the planting only reaches the base of the existing five-foot fence, thereby providing no screening. It is also stated that the fence itself is of an alternated slats construction, and with the differential in height provides limited screening between the site and their property. The objector states that they should not have to incur the expense of a replacement suitable fence in order to provide privacy mitigation for the proposed adjoining houses or their property. Also, the view is expressed that the proposed depth of boundary planting is largely reliant on existing planting and is best described as limited in nature.</p> <p>The existing hedgerow along the boundary is to be retained and supplemented with new hawthorne hedge if there are any gaps in the existing boundary vegetation. A native species hedgerow is considered to be an acceptable boundary treatment. A replacement fence is not considered to be necessary. The landscape plan as proposed is considered to be acceptable.</p>
Planting.	<p>The view is expressed that the provision of two trees will provide limited or no screening for a significant number of years whilst they mature. And that the trees over time grow to a significant height and when in leaf will block direct light reaching property 1 Baronscourt Link placing the property and garden in shadow for a significant part of the day.</p> <p>Site number 2 has one sycamore tree proposed within its rear garden and site number 3 has one lime tree proposed within its rear garden. These are to provide landscaping within the development. Planting as proposed is considered to be acceptable. A degree of overshadowing from existing vegetation is noted and it is considered that the planting as proposed will not significantly add to this.</p>
Height difference.	<p>The view is expressed that there hasn't been an analysis of height differential of the proposed development generally with regard to the existing Baronscourt estate, particularly 1 Baronscourt Road and 1 Baronscourt Link.</p> <p>The differences in height between the application site and the surrounding existing properties have been considered. The proposal has been designed taking on board the level differences and complies with the prevailing policy and guidance.</p>

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

Week Ending 7th March 2025

Item Number 4			
Application Reference	LA05/2022/1076/F	Date Valid	14.11.2022
Description of Proposal	Renewal of planning approval for part change of use of existing car wash No. 219 Moira Road, Lisburn to car sales	Location	Lands to the east of 219 Moira Road, Lisburn
Group Recommendation	Refusal	Case Officer	Catherine Gray
Reasons for Recommendation			
<p>The proposal is contrary to Policy COU1 of the Lisburn and Castlereagh City Council Plan Strategy, in that it is not a type of development which in principle is considered to be acceptable in the countryside.</p> <p>The proposal is contrary to Policy TC1 of the Lisburn and Castlereagh City Council Plan Strategy, in that it has not been demonstrated that an adequate sequential approach has been adopted that identifies that there are no suitable sites available within the city/town centre.</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 7th March 2025

Item Number 5			
Application Reference	LA05/2023/0012/F	Date Valid	10.01.2023
Description of Proposal	New one and a half storey infill dwelling with detached double garage	Location	Land 60m south of 20 Magheradartin Road, Royal Hillsborough, BT26 6LY and 75m north west of 22 Magheradartin Road, Royal Hillsborough,
Group Recommendation	Refusal	Case Officer	Sinead McCloskey
Reasons for Recommendation			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The proposal is contrary to Policy COU1 of the Lisburn and Castlereagh City Council Plan Strategy, in that it is not a type of development which in principle is considered to be acceptable in the countryside. ▪ The proposal is contrary to Policy COU8 of the Lisburn and Castlereagh City Council Plan Strategy, in that the development, if approved, would add to a ribbon of development along Magheradartin Road as there is not a small gap sufficient to accommodate two dwellings within an otherwise substantial and continuously built up frontage whilst respecting the existing pattern of development and being appropriate to the existing plot width and plot size. ▪ The proposal is contrary to criteria (c) and (e) of Policy COU16 of the Lisburn and Castlereagh City Council Plan Strategy, in that the proposed development would, if permitted, not respect the traditional pattern of settlement exhibited in that area and would have an adverse impact on the rural character of the area. 			
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 7th March 2025

Item Number 6			
Application Reference	LA05/2022/0307/F	Date Valid	18.03.2022
Description of Proposal	Glenside Quarry Glenside Road Dunmurry Lisburn	Location	Application under Section 54 of the Planning Act (NI) 2011 to vary Condition 1 of planning approval S/2008/0912/F (relating to delivery hours) to allow deliveries between the hours of 06.00-20.00 Monday to Saturday and 08.00-14.00 on Sundays from existing hours of 07.00-20.00 Monday to Saturday
Group Recommendation	Approval	Case Officer	Sinead McCloskey
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		
Excessive and increased road traffic, the road is not fit for purpose - it wasn't designed to accommodate incessant, ongoing high volume heavy traffic.	As explained in the supporting statement the rationale for the proposed extension to the operating hours is not to increase operations at the site, but to facilitate the movement of material at an earlier time to another site to avoid unnecessary delays. It is also stated that the proposal will ensure no traffic is sitting on the Glenside Road awaiting it to open ensuring the safety of road users. It is confirmed that there are no increases in traffic movements/tonnage under this application.		
Increased noise disturbance – affecting my sleep, resulting in extreme fatigue and low mood.	A Noise Impact Assessment was submitted stating that there would be no adverse impact to residential amenity. Environmental Health were consulted, and they responded stating that they had no objection.		
Nuisance smells.	The proposal does not relate to any physical operational development. It is also confirmed that there are no changes to the tonnage or type of		

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

Week Ending 7th March 2025

	material associated with the site. Any changes in this regard would require planning permission. No concerns relating to odour were raised by Environmental Health.
Health and Safety.	No physical operational development is proposed with this application. It is stated that deliveries to the site can now commence at 6.00am to avoid a build-up of traffic on the road entrance at 7.00, thus improving road safety. There are no health concerns relating to the proposal, with no concerns raised by the Environmental Health Department in this regard.
Proposed operating hours is antisocial and will affect my quality of life and health.	As above, the Environmental Health Department in the Council did not raise any concerns with regards to any potential adverse effects on the residential amenity of any nearby dwellings.
This is a residential area in a semi-rural location which is at odds with the both the proposed extension and operating hours.	The application is wholly in the countryside, out with any settlement. There are residential dwellings within proximity of the site as is expected within a rural environment. This is an existing facility. This application is not for any physical operation, does not include any extension to the facilities and relates solely to hours of operation. The proposal has been assessed against policy and the advice of Environmental Health and found to be acceptable.
Not having been consulted with the application.	This neighbour is not notifiable as the red line around the application site does not abut the curtilage of their property.

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

Week Ending 7th March 2025

Item Number 7			
Application Reference	LA05/2023/0477/O	Date Valid	08.06.2023
Description of Proposal	Erection of 2 no. infill dwellings under PPS 21 CTY8	Location	Lands immediately to the West of No. 18 Drumlough Road, Hillsborough
Group Recommendation	Refusal	Case Officer	Sinead McCloskey
Reasons for Recommendation			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The proposal is contrary to Policy COU1 of the Lisburn and Castlereagh City Council Plan Strategy, in that it is not a type of development which in principle is considered to be acceptable in the countryside. ▪ The proposal is contrary to Policy COU8 of the Lisburn and Castlereagh City Council Plan Strategy, in that the development, if approved, would create a ribbon of development along Drumlough Road, as there is not a small gap sufficient to accommodate two dwellings within an otherwise substantial and continuously built up frontage whilst respecting the existing pattern of development and being appropriate to the existing plot width and plot size. ▪ The proposal is contrary to Criteria (c), (d) and (e) of Policy COU16 of the Lisburn and Castlereagh City Council Plan Strategy, in that the proposed development would, if permitted, not respect the traditional pattern of settlement exhibited in that area, mar the distinction of the defined settlement limit of Drumlough Road and would have an adverse impact on the rural character of the area. 			
Representations			
Objection Letters	Support Letters	Objection Petitions	Support Petitions
1	N/A	N/A	N/A
Consideration of Objections			
Issue	Consideration of Issue		
Concerns regarding the size of the two homes on the land.	This an outline application so no details relating to the dwellings has been provided. However, an indicative site layout shows the footprint of the dwellings within the plot. It demonstrates two dwellings of similar size. The assessment above found the footprint of the dwellings is within the size range of buildings that make up the frontage. Notwithstanding this, other tests associated with the policy assessment found the plots proposed for each dwelling are not comparable to average plot sizes within the context of the site.		
Concerns if the properties are more than one storey light will be	This is an outline application so no details relating to the dwellings has been provided. However, an indicative site layout shows the footprint of the dwellings within the plot. The dwellings are both shown to sit side by side with the existing dwellings on either side. This is generally seen as		

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

Week Ending 7th March 2025

<p>affected and the property overlooked.</p>	<p>an acceptable layout arrangement. Design details are reviewed at reserved matters stage and concerns in terms of overlooking from any adjacent windows would be assessed at this stage. At this part of the process the height of the dwellings would also be assessed, and any undesirable adverse effects such as loss of light cause by overshadowing.</p>
--	--

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

Week Ending 7th March 2025

Item Number 8			
Application Reference	LA05/2019/0316/F	Date Valid	25.03.2019
Description of Proposal	Proposed 4 no. detached dwellings	Location	Lands at 31 & 33 Islandkelly Park, Lisburn
Group Recommendation	Approval	Case Officer	Louise O'Reilly
Reasons for Recommendation			
All relevant planning material considerations have been satisfied.			
Representations			
Objection Letters	Support Letters	Objection Petitions	Support Petitions
3	N/A	N/A	N/A
Consideration of Objections			
Issue	Consideration of Issue		
Replacement of 2 dwellings with 6 does not respect the surrounding context.	The scheme has been revised and reduced to 4 detached dwellings, with two to the front and two dwellings to the rear. It is considered that the layout, form, density, height and design of the dwellings respects the surrounding context.		
Significant increase in terms of layout, scale and massing of buildings at the site.	The ratio of built form to plot size is characteristic of the area and is similar to the plot sizes of the other similar dwellings in Islandkelly Park, Killowen Grange and Lady Wallace Road/Gardens.		
Lack of detail on landscaping provisions which would soften the impact of the development.	Landscaping details have been provided on the proposed site layout (drawing no. 04 Revision 12) date stamped 14 th November 2024. Additional tree planting is proposed along the eastern boundary which will add screening along the boundary with Lady Wallace and assist in integrating the development into the streetscape.		
Mature vegetation removed along the eastern site boundary during site clearance.	The site had been cleared at the time of site inspection and compensatory tree planting is proposed to provide screening along the eastern boundary.		
Potential for overlooking of existing properties close to eastern boundary, namely	The proposal has been assessed against Policy HOU4 and supplementary guidance as stipulated in Creating Places and it is considered that it will not result in the loss of residential amenity for the neighbouring properties due to the separation distance to the		

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

Week Ending 7th March 2025

nos. 72-78 Lady Wallace Road due to proximity of dwellings to this boundary.	boundaries, the position of the window openings and the heights of the proposed dwellings.
Loss of light/privacy.	The proposal will not result in the loss of light or privacy to an unacceptable degree for any of the neighbouring dwellings that surround the site due to the adequate separation distances to the boundary.
Lack of topographical data in relation to ground levels.	The topography of the site is such that there is only a very gradual slope up to towards the east. Finished floor levels and road levels have been provided. The Council has determined there is sufficient information on the proposed site layout to determine that there will be no adverse impact on neighbouring properties by reason of height, scale, massing or dominance. Adequate separation is provided to the boundaries, and the buildings are not sited at higher levels than the neighbouring buildings.
Overall, failure to comply with Policy QD1 of PPS 7 and PPS 12 Planning Control Principle 1 and Planning Control Principle.	It is concluded that the proposal meets the operational policies contained within the LCCC Plan Strategy in relation to housing, namely HOU1, HOU3, HOU4, HOU6 and HOU8. Policy QD1 of PPS 7 and PPS 12 Planning Control Principle 1 and Planning Control Principle 2 are now superseded by the operational policies in the adopted LCCC Plan Strategy.
Proposal contrary to the addendum to PPS 7 due to impact on character of area.	It is considered that the proposal will not have an adverse impact on the character of the area and is in keeping with the established character in terms of siting, design, plot size, layout and heights of the dwellings. The addendum to PPS 7 is now superseded by the operational policies in the adopted LCCC Plan Strategy.
Absence of site analysis and Design Concept Statement.	A design concept statement is submitted for the revised scheme which includes an analysis of the site. The policy requirement is met.