

<b>COMMITTEE ITEM</b>	<b>3.4- ADDENDUM</b>
<b>APPLICATION NO</b>	<b>LA03/2023/0060/F</b>
<b>DEA</b>	<b>THREE MILE WATER</b>
<b>COMMITTEE INTEREST</b>	<b>ADDENDUM TO COMMITTEE REPORT</b>
<b>RECOMMENDATION</b>	<b>REFUSE PLANNING PERMISSION</b>
<b>PROPOSAL</b>	Proposed installation of a 20m telecoms street pole with antenna and associated ancillary equipment cabinets
<b>SITE/LOCATION</b>	Area of adopted footpath outside 147, Jordanstown Road, Newtownabbey, BT37 0LP
<b>APPLICANT</b>	CK Hutchison Networks (UK) Ltd.
<b>AGENT</b>	James Reilly c/o Dot Surveying Ltd
<b>LAST SITE VISIT</b>	14th June 2023
<b>CASE OFFICER</b>	Tierna Mc Veigh Tel: 028 90340401 Email: <a href="mailto:tierna.mcveigh@antrimandnewtownabbey.gov.uk">tierna.mcveigh@antrimandnewtownabbey.gov.uk</a>
<p><b>Full details of this application, including the application forms, relevant drawings, consultation responses and any representations received are available to view at the Planning Portal <a href="https://planningregister.planningsystemni.gov.uk">https://planningregister.planningsystemni.gov.uk</a></b></p>	
<b>BACKGROUND</b>	
<p>Following the completion of the Planning Committee report, a further site visit took place by Officers on 14th June 2023. At this site visit, it was determined that Refusal Reason 1 stated within the original Planning Committee Report should be withdrawn and a new reason for refusal added, the reasons for which are addressed below.</p>	
<b>ASSESSMENT OF PLANNING ISSUES/MATERIAL CONSIDERATIONS</b>	
<p>In the original Planning Committee Report the following refusal reasons were recommended:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The proposal is contrary to the provisions contained in the Strategic Planning Policy Statement and Policy TEL 1 of Planning Policy Statement 10 Telecommunications, and relevant guidance within DCAN 14 in that the proposal, if approved, will result in unacceptable damage to the visual amenity of 147 Jordanstown Road by way of its height, location and prominence.</li> <li>2. The proposal is contrary to the provisions contained in the Strategic Planning Policy Statement and Policy AMP 1 of Planning Policy Statement 3 Access Movement and Parking, in that the proposal would, if permitted, prejudice the safety and convenience of road users since the erection of the telecommunication pole and associated cabinets in the proposed position would restrict the existing visibility at the junction of Mount Pleasant Park with the Jordanstown Road.</li> </ol> <p>With respect to Refusal Reason 1, DCAN 14: Siting and Design of Radio Telecommunications Equipment highlights the fundamental principle in siting and</p>	

designing equipment is to minimise the contrast between the equipment and its surroundings.

The proposed development involves the installation of a single 20-metre-high telecommunications pole and three (3) equipment cabinets positioned 1.4 metres to the northwest of the pole. The heights of the three (3) separate cabinets from finished ground level are 1.2 metres, 1.6 metres and 1.8 metres and together measure 3.3 metres in width.

The original Planning Committee Report stated that the siting of the proposed telecommunications mast, located 1.7 metres to the front of No. 147 Jordanstown Road would result in an unacceptable impact to the resident's outlook from their living room and their visual amenity, contrary to the policy provisions of Policy TEL 1 of PPS 10.

However, following a site visit by Officers on 14th June 2023 account was taken of the 1.5 metre high wall and existing mature trees and shrubbery to the front of the single storey property at No. 147 Jordanstown Road. It was considered that the mature vegetation along the roadside boundary of the property would screen the telecommunications pole from any views within the internal rooms of the dwelling and therefore the visual amenity of the residents is not considered so significant as to warrant a refusal in relation to this matter. As such, Officers have determined that Refusal Reason 1 as stated on the original Committee Report should be withdrawn.

In addition, the original Committee Report identified that the surrounding urban fabric of the Jordanstown Road would absorb the visual impact of the proposal and as such the design and appearance of the proposed telecommunication pole and associated equipment is acceptable for this urban area. Whilst the original Committee Report stated that there would be a localised visual impact through the installation of such apparatus, they considered that this would not overly detract from the character of the existing streetscape or indeed the wider area. The Committee Report determined that because the application site is not located within an environmentally sensitive location, nor is it positioned close to an environmentally sensitive feature, the design and appearance of the proposal was considered to be acceptable.

The proposed mast is 20 metres in height and will extend just over 15 metres above the properties on the northeastern side of the Jordanstown Road. It is considered that due to the height of the proposed telecommunication mast and its prominent position along the roadside of this leafy urban location, the proposed structure will appear incongruous in the streetscape. It is also considered that the proposed development will dominate the immediate surroundings of the area and critical views of the proposed telecommunications mast will be evident when travelling in both directions along the Jordanstown Road. Given the height, siting and design of the development proposal it is considered to be visually intrusive in the streetscape by way of its height, location and prominence, and as such would have a detrimental impact on the character of the surrounding area.

Consequently, Refusal Reason 1 now reads as follows:

The proposal is contrary to the policy provisions of the Strategic Planning Policy Statement and Policy TEL 1 of Planning Policy Statement 10 Telecommunications, and relevant guidance within DCAN 14, in that the proposal, if approved, would be visually intrusive in the streetscape, by way of its height, location and prominence and would have a detrimental impact on the visual amenity of the area.

There is no change to Refusal Reason 2 as stated in the original Committee Report.

### **CONCLUSION**

The following is a summary of the main reasons for the recommendation:

- The principle of the development has been established and is acceptable;
- The design and appearance of the development is considered acceptable;
- The proposal is considered to have a detrimental visual impact on the visual amenity of the area;
- The proposal harms the environmental quality or character of the local area; and
- The proposal is contrary to Policy AMP 1 of PPS 3 in that it will reduce the existing visibility splays at the Junction of Mount Pleasant Road and Jordanstown Road.

### **RECOMMENDATION**

### **REFUSE PLANNING PERMISSION**

### **PROPOSED REASONS FOR REFUSAL**

1. The proposal is contrary to the policy provisions of the Strategic Planning Policy Statement and Policy TEL 1 of Planning Policy Statement 10 Telecommunications, and relevant guidance within DCAN 14 in that the proposal, if approved, would be visually intrusive in the streetscape, by way of its height, location and prominence and would have a detrimental impact on the visual amenity of the area.
2. The proposal is contrary to the policy provisions of the Strategic Planning Policy Statement and Planning Policy Statement 3, Access, Movement and Parking, as it has not been demonstrated that the proposed development, if permitted, would not prejudice the safety and convenience of road users because it has not been demonstrated that the proposed development would not be located within the required visibility splays.

<b>COMMITTEE ITEM</b>	<b>3.9 - ADDENDUM</b>
<b>APPLICATION NO</b>	<b>LA03/2023/0070/F</b>
<b>DEA</b>	<b>THREEMILEWATER</b>
<b>COMMITTEE INTEREST</b>	<b>ADDENDUM TO COMMITTEE REPORT</b>
<b>RECOMMENDATION</b>	<b>REFUSE PLANNING PERMISSION</b>
<b>PROPOSAL</b>	Ground floor side extension with two storey rear extension and internal works and new front porch.
<b>SITE/LOCATION</b>	8 Gleneden Park, Jordanstown, Newtownabbey, BT37 0QL
<b>APPLICANT</b>	Grace & Matt Evans
<b>AGENT</b>	Robert Gilmour Architects
<b>LAST SITE VISIT</b>	13 <sup>th</sup> March 2023
<b>CASE OFFICER</b>	Michael Ward Tel: 028 903 40413 Email: michael.ward@antrimandnewtownabbey.gov.uk
<p><b>Full details of this application, including the application forms, relevant drawings, consultation responses and any representations received are available to view at the Planning Portal <a href="https://planningregister.planningsystemni.gov.uk">https://planningregister.planningsystemni.gov.uk</a></b></p>	
<b>ASSESSMENT OF PLANNING ISSUES/MATERIAL CONSIDERATIONS</b>	
<p>Since the preparation and publication of the Committee Report, amendments to the proposal have been submitted, (Drawing Nos 04/1, 06/1 and 07 dated 16<sup>th</sup> April 2023) which have been uploaded and are available for Members to view on the planning register.</p> <p>The amended scheme reduces the eaves height of the single storey extension to match the eaves height of the garage as existing, the changes also include a reduction to the depth of the first floor bedroom along the eastern elevation by 1.1 metres and angling the eastern gable wall. This effectively reduces the first floor gable elevation by 2.5 metres, which is an attempt to address the concerns in relation to overshadowing and loss of light to the adjacent neighbour at 6 Gleneden Park.</p> <p>As noted within the full Committee Report, the initial submission failed the angle test as laid out within the justification and amplification of Policy EXT 1. However, the amended scheme now meets with the angle test guidance. However, concerns remain in relation to the impact on the amenity of the neighbouring properties, specifically in relation to the dominant and overbearing nature of the proposal on No.6 Gleneden park.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that the eaves height of the single storey extension has been reduced to match the eaves height of the existing garage, however, the addition of 4.4 metres to the front of the garage effectively results in the built form extending directly along the neighbouring boundary which lies adjacent to a set of patio doors serving the neighbouring dwelling. Additionally, although the two storey rear return has a flat roof, the overall height extends beyond the eaves line of the host dwelling by approximately 0.9 metres which results in an overall height of 5.9 metres. Taking into consideration the relationship with the neighbouring property at No.6 Gleneden Park and the presence of a similar two storey rear extension located immediately to the</p>	

east at No.4, the overall cumulative impact will cause the entire rear return of No.6 to feel "hemmed in". The occupants are likely to experience an overbearing and dominant impact which will have a detrimental impact upon neighbour amenity.

The additional information does not result in a change to the recommendation to refuse planning permission, a change to the proposed reasons of refusal are included as detailed below to reflect the supporting documentation.

### **CONCLUSION**

The following is a summary of the main reasons for the recommendation:

- The principle of the development is considered acceptable;
- The scale, massing, design and appearance of the proposal is considered acceptable;
- The proposal will unduly affect the amenity of neighbouring properties;
- The proposal will not have a detrimental impact on trees or the environmental quality of the area.
- Sufficient space remains within the curtilage for parking and recreation purposes.

### **RECOMMENDATION**

### **REFUSE PLANNING PERMISSION**

### **PROPOSED REASON OF REFUSAL**

1. The proposal is contrary to the policy provisions of the Strategic Planning Policy Statement and Policy EXT1 of the Addendum to Planning Policy Statement 7, Residential Extensions and Alterations, in that, the proposed development, if permitted, would result in a detrimental impact to the amenity of neighbouring residents by way of dominance and the overbearing nature of the proposed extension.

<b>COMMITTEE ITEM</b>	<b>3.10 – ADDENDUM</b>
<b>APPLICATION NO</b>	<b>LA03/2023/0038/F</b>
<b>DEA</b>	<b>MACEDON</b>
<b>COMMITTEE INTEREST</b>	<b>ADDENDUM TO COMMITTEE REPORT</b>
<b>RECOMMENDATION</b>	<b>REFUSE PLANNING PERMISSION</b>
<b>PROPOSAL</b>	Boundary fence (retrospective)
<b>SITE/LOCATION</b>	12 Merville Mews, Newtownabbey, BT37 9SP
<b>APPLICANT</b>	Mr James Whiteside
<b>AGENT</b>	JWA Design
<b>LAST SITE VISIT</b>	27 <sup>th</sup> March 2023
<b>CASE OFFICER</b>	Michael Ward Tel: 028 903 40413 Email: michael.ward@antrimandnewtownabbey.gov.

**Full details of this application, including the application forms, relevant drawings, consultation responses and any representations received are available to view at the Planning Portal <https://planningregister.planningsystemni.gov.uk>**

#### **ASSESSMENT OF PLANNING ISSUES/MATERIAL CONSIDERATIONS**

Members are advised that an additional reason for refusal for the above application is included within this addendum which relates to road safety specifically in relation to the level of visibility splays available.

The additional reason for refusal does not introduce any new issues than that previously addressed within the full Planning Committee report. As detailed within the Committee Report, due to the proximity of the fence to a road junction with Shore Road and Whitehouse Park, the visibility on exiting Whitehouse Park is restricted by the fence. As such DfI Roads were consulted on the application and indicated that visibility of 4.5 by 90 metres is required, however, the maximum visibility that can be achieved is 2.0 by 90 metres.

While it is accepted that there was formerly a hedge along the boundary of the application site, this was removed prior to the submission of the application and therefore cannot form part of the consideration. In the circumstances the subject fence blocks the visibility splay at the junction of Whitehouse Park and Shore Road which is considered to prejudice road safety.

The applicant has been made aware that an additional reason for refusal is to be imposed to reflect the detail within the full Committee Report. There is no change to the recommendation to refuse planning permission, a change to the proposed reasons of refusal are included as detailed below.

#### **CONCLUSION**

The following is a summary of the main reasons for the recommendation:

- The principle of the development is considered acceptable;
- The scale, massing, design and appearance of the fence is considered unacceptable;
- There will be no detrimental impact upon neighbouring properties;
- The proposal has resulted in the acceptable loss of a portion of hedgerow;

- Sufficient space remains within the curtilage for parking and recreation purposes;
- The proposal will result in a detrimental impact to road safety as the required visibility splays in not achievable.

<b>RECOMMENDATION</b>	<b>REFUSE PLANNING PERMISSION</b>
-----------------------	-----------------------------------

<b>PROPOSED REASONS FOR REFUSAL</b>
-------------------------------------

1. The proposal is contrary to the Policy provisions of the Strategic Planning Policy Statement for Northern Ireland and Policy EXT 1 of Addendum to Planning Policy Statement 7 "Residential Extensions and Alterations in that if the development were approved, it would detract from the appearance and character of the site and surrounding area by way of scale, massing, design and inappropriate use of materials.
2. The proposal is contrary to the provisions of the Strategic Planning Policy Statement and Planning Policy Statement 3, Access, Movement and Parking, Policy AMP 2, in that the subject fence would, if permitted, prejudice the safety and convenience of road users as it would interfere with the visibility splays at the junction of Whitehouse Park and Shore Road.