COMMITTEE ITEM	**3.8**
APPLICATION NO	**LA03/2025/0928/F**
DEA	**AIRPORT**
COMMITTEE INTEREST	**ADDENDUM TO COMMITTEE REPORT**
RECOMMENDATION	**GRANT PLANNING PERMISSION**
PROPOSAL	Proposed extension to existing commercial yard/depot including HGV parking, material storage bays, site access, landscaping and associated ancillary works.
SITE/LOCATION	Lands 85m North of 386a Ballyclare Road, Newtownabbey, BT36 4TQ
APPLICANT	Paul Marley, EJC Contracts Ltd
AGENT	Bell Rolston
LAST SITE VISIT	15 January 2026
CASE OFFICER	Sairead McCarthy Tel: 028 90340406 Email: sairead.mccarthy@antrimandnewtownabbey.gov.uk

The full details of this application, including the application forms, relevant drawings, consultation responses and any representations received are available to view at the Northern Ireland Planning Portal
https://planningregister.planningsystemni.gov.uk/application/705814

ASSESSMENT OF PLANNING ISSUES/MATERIAL CONSIDERATIONS

Members, following the publication of the Planning Committee Report, two additional letters of representation from the same objector have been received taking the total number of objections to eleven. The full representations made regarding this proposal are available to view online at the Planning Portal: https://planningregister.planningsystemni.gov.uk/application/705814

A summary of the key points raised within the additional objections is provided below:

- The EIA Determination sheet (dated 15 September 2026) is inaccurate and cannot be relied upon in the determination of the application;
- The DfI response refers to Drawing Number 03C, whereas the most recent drawing is Drawing Number 03D; and
- Land within the ownership of the objector is required to provide the visibility splays and the objector states consent to use this land will not be given.

The objector has pointed out that under the heading 'Transfrontier Impacts' within the EIA Determination Sheet (dated 15 September 2026), reference is made to 'residential development'. In addition, the objector has queried the size of application site, stating that the previous application drawing recorded a site area of 0.890 ha, whereas the EIA Determination sheet states the site area under this current application is only 0.84 ha. The objector has stated that the EIA should identify the precise land and boundaries being screened.

With regards to the reference to 'residential development', it is acknowledged that this is erroneous and a new EIA Determination was carried out (dated 15 October

2026). This determination is based on the site area of the application site (approximately 0.84ha) which has been identified as lands within the red line on the Site Location Plan (Drawing 01A, date stamped received 27 July 2026). The outcome of this screening remains the same, in that it is a nil determination. The proposed development is a Schedule 2 development however, having considered its characteristics, location and potential effects, it is considered that it is not likely to have significant effects on the environment and does not require to be accompanied by an Environmental Statement.

As noted in the Planning Committee Report, the appropriate notice has been served by the applicant upon the relevant landowners, one of whom is the objector. It is also acknowledged that the objector has stated they will not give permission for the applicant to use their land to provide the required visibility splays; and in their most recent letter, the objector has queried whether DfI Roads remain satisfied that the required visibility can be provided, delivered and permanently retained. The objector has further queried the most recent DfI Roads response (dated 27 August 2026) which makes reference to Drawing Number 03C (date stamped received 13 August 2026), whereas the most up to date drawing is numbered 03D (date stamped 10 September 2026).

Both Drawing Number 03C (date stamped received 13 August 2026) and Drawing Number 03D (date stamped 10 September 2026) are Proposed Site Plan Drawings which show the provision of visibility splays of 4.5 metres x 165 metres. The difference in the two drawings relates to the positioning of the 2.4 metre high mesh panel boundary fence, which has been relocated along the northern boundary of the proposed yard area on Drawing Number 03D, and not along the roadside boundary as shown on Drawing Number 03C. No amendments were made to the required visibility splays on Drawing Number 03D, and therefore, further consultation with DfI Roads was not required.

As per the consultation response (dated 27 August 2026), DfI Roads is satisfied that visibility splays of 4.5 metres x 165 metres can be provided, delivered and maintained. In order to provide the sightlines, the use of third party land is required which is currently outside the ownership of the applicant, however, as previously stated in the Planning Committee Report, land ownership issues and disputes are outside the remit of planning, should planning permission be forthcoming, a negative condition (proposed Condition 05) can be applied requiring the applicant to implement the sight lines prior to any other development taking place. In addition, the applicant can be advised that planning permission does not confer title and it is the responsibility of the developer to ensure that they control all the lands necessary to carry out the proposed development.

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 not unduly affect the amenity of neighbouring properties;
- Sufficient space is proposed within the curtilage of the application site for parking; and manoeuvring of vehicles; and
- There are no significant concerns regarding flooding.

RECOMMENDATION	GRANT PLANNING PERMISSION

PROPOSED CONDITIONS:

1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of 5 years from the date of this permission.

   Reason: To comply with the requirements of Section 61 of the Planning Act (Northern Ireland) 2011.

2. The storage yard hereby permitted shall be used only for the storage of vehicles, and materials ancillary to the operations of EJC Contracts Ltd and shall only be run in conjunction with that business and for no other purpose without the express written consent of the Council.

   Reason: To control the land uses on the site.

3. All existing planting indicated on Drawing Number 03D date stamped received 10/09/2026 shall be allowed to grow on and be permanently retained. If any retained tree is removed, uprooted, destroyed or dies within the lifetime of the development it shall be replaced within the next planting season by another tree or trees in the same location of a similar size and species as specified by the Council.

   Reason: In the interest of visual amenity and to ensure the provision, establishment and maintenance of a high standard of landscape.

4. The proposed landscaping works as indicated on Drawing Number 03D date stamped received 10/09/2026 shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details and the appropriate British Standard or other recognised Codes of Practice during the first planting season after the commencement of development.

   Reason: To ensure the provision, establishment and maintenance of a high standard of landscape.

5. The vehicular access, including visibility splays and any forward sight distance, shall be provided in accordance with Drawing No. 03D date stamped received 10/09/2026, prior to the commencement of any other development hereby permitted. The area within the visibility splays and any forward sight line shall be cleared to provide a level surface no higher than 250mm above the level of the adjoining carriageway and such splays shall be retained and kept clear thereafter.

Reason: To ensure there is a satisfactory means of access in the interests of road safety and the convenience of road users.

6. The gradient of the access road shall not exceed 8% (1 in 12.5) over the first 5m outside the road boundary. Where the vehicular access crosses a footway, the access gradient shall be between 4% (1 in 25) maximum and 2.5% (1 in 40) minimum and shall be formed so that there is no abrupt change of slope along the footway.

   Reason: To ensure there is a satisfactory means of access in interests of road safety and the convenience of road user.

7. Any open drain/watercourse exposed during construction and provision of visibility splays shall be piped with suitably sized pipes to the satisfaction of the Council, all costs being borne by the Developer.

   Reason: To ensure any drain/watercourse are not obstructed and in the interest of road safety and the convenience of road users.

8. The development shall not become operational until the hard surfaced areas have been constructed and permanently marked in accordance with the approved Drawing No. 03D date stamped received 10/09/2026 to provide adequate facilities for parking, servicing and circulating within the site. No part of these hard surfaced areas shall be used for any purpose at any time other than for the parking and movement of vehicles.

   Reason: To ensure that adequate provision has been made for parking, servicing and traffic circulation within the site.

9. The development hereby permitted shall not operate on anytime outside 07:00 – 23:00 hours, Monday to Friday and shall not operate on Saturdays and Sundays.

   Reason: In order to protect night-time amenity at nearby sensitive receptors.

10. All vehicles operating within the development hereby permitted shall be fitted with wide band/white noise reversing alarms.

    Reason: In order to protect amenity at nearby sensitive receptors.

11. An earth embankment shall be retained to the west of the site between the yard and nearby sensitive receptors as shown on Drawing Number 03D, date stamped received 10/09/2026.

    Reason: In order to protect amenity at nearby sensitive receptors.

12. Light intrusion from the development into windows at nearby sensitive properties shall not exceed 5 Ev (lux) on anytime between 07:00 and 23:00hrs and 1 Ev (lux) on anytime between 23:00 and 07:00 hours.

    Reason: In order to protect amenity at nearby sensitive receptors.

COMMITTEE ITEM	**3.9 ADDENDUM**
APPLICATION NO	**LA03/2025/0906/F**
DEA	**AIRPORT**
COMMITTEE INTEREST	**REFUSAL RECOMMENDED**
RECOMMENDATION	**REFUSE PLANNING PERMISSION**
PROPOSAL	2no. proposed free range broiler houses, for up to 39.8k free range broilers, together with ancillary building, swale, meal bins, new concrete apron, new access onto Burnside Road and landscaping.
SITE/LOCATION	Approx. 319m southeast of 35 Burnside Road, Dunadry
APPLICANT	P&H Hanna
AGENT	David McMeekin
LAST SITE VISIT	15th January 2026
CASE OFFICER	Harry Russell Tel: 028 903 40408 Email: harry.russell@antrimandnewtownabbey.gov.uk

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/application/705343

ASSESSMENT OF PLANNING ISSUES/MATERIAL CONSIDERATIONS

Since the drafting of the Planning Committee Report, six (6) additional objections have been received from six (6) properties including three (3) neighbour notified properties. A summary of the objections is provided below:

- Road safety and increased traffic;
- Odour impact upon neighbouring amenity;
- Impact upon wildlife and vegetation;
- Impacts regarding waste management;
- Visual impact of development upon character of the area; and
- The development is sited away from the existing farm.

A number of these concerns including the; odour impact, the waste management impact, the wildlife and vegetation impact, and the visual impact of the development upon the landscape are addressed in the previous Planning Committee Report.

In terms of road safety, DfI Roads was content with the proposed access arrangements subject to conditions. The Transport Assessment Form (TAF) (Document 06, date stamped 4th December 2025) submitted with the application indicates that over a 6–8 week cycle, the development would generate approximately 3-4 vehicle movements per week. Accordingly, while the development would increase traffic generation along the Burnside Road, this would not lead to a significant adverse impact.

The objections raised with respect to the development being sited away from the existing farm has been accepted and is included as the proposed reason for refusal.

CONCLUSION	
The following is a summary of the main reasons for the recommendation: • The proposal is contrary to Policy DM 4 of the ANPS as the development is not sited beside the existing farm buildings; • It is considered that the proposal will integrate appropriately with the surrounding landscape; • The proposal is not considered to result in adverse impacts on neighbouring properties; • The proposal is not considered to prejudice road safety; and • There remains potential ecological concerns in relation to designated sites in the Republic of Ireland.	
RECOMMENDATION	**REFUSE PLANNING PERMISSION**
PROPOSED REASON OF REFUSAL	
1. The proposal is contrary to paragraph 6.73 of the Strategic Planning Policy Statement, and criterion (c) of DM 4.1, and DM 4.3 of the Antrim and Newtownabbey Plan Strategy, in that it has not been demonstrated why the development has not been sited beside the existing farm buildings nor has it been sufficiently demonstrated that the alternative site away from the existing buildings on the farm holding is essential for the efficient functioning of the farm business, that there are demonstrable environmental or health and safety grounds to substantiate this, or that there is a need to protect the amenity of nearby residents.	

COMMITTEE ITEM	**3.11 ADDENDUM**
APPLICATION NO	**LA03/2026/0341/F**
DEA	**BALLYCLARE**
COMMITTEE INTEREST	**ADDENDUM TO COMMITTEE REPORT**
RECOMMENDATION	**REFUSE PLANNING PERMISSION**
PROPOSAL	Proposed erection of an organic free range shed with 2no. feed bins, manure storage shed, underground effluent tank, PV panels, associated site works including yard areas, drainage, swale, and lane and proposed new entrance to serve new poultry unit. Shed to contain 9,000 free range laying hens.
SITE/LOCATION	Lands 270m North West of 15 Sawmill Road, Ballyclare, BT39 9JP
APPLICANT	Ken Craig
AGENT	Farm Design Solutions
LAST SITE VISIT	3rd July 2026
CASE OFFICER	Alice Gallagher Tel: 028 903 40414 Email: alice.gallagher@antrimandnewtownabbey.gov.uk

The full details of this application, including the application forms, relevant drawings, consultation responses and any representations made are available to view at the Northern Ireland Planning Portal
https://planningregister.planningsystemni.gov.uk/application/709783

ASSESSMENT OF PLANNING ISSUES/MATERIAL CONSIDERATIONS

Following publication of the Planning Committee Report the agent submitted a Supporting Statement (Document 17 date stamped 12th October 2026) which provided further justification for the alternative siting of the proposed poultry unit away from the existing buildings on the farm holding.

In the Supporting Statement, the agent advised that locating the proposed poultry unit beside existing farm buildings at either the Collin Road or at the out farm on the Sawmill Road would, in his experience, result in unacceptable noise and odour impacts. However, the agent has failed to provide an independent noise and odour assessment to substantiate these assertions.

Additionally, the agent claimed a consultant had advised that siting the proposal adjacent to the Collin Road farmyard would risk excessive ammonia exposure to flora within a nearby priority habitat. However, no details regarding the consultant or supporting evidence were provided to substantiate this assertion. Similarly, the agent stated that locating the project at the Sawmill Road out-farm would negatively impact priority habitats but yet again failed to provide any independent expert evidence.

The agent also asserted that if the proposal was to be sited adjacent to the farm buildings at Collin Road there would be a disconnect between the proposed poultry shed and the existing buildings. Such reasoning does not meet any of the exceptions set out under DM 4.3 of the ANPS. The agent also advised that a floodplain within fields at Sawmill Road dictated the proposed siting, however, no concerns relating to flooding at Collin Road were raised to be able to discount these lands.

Under the "Other Considerations" section of the Supporting Statement (Document 17, date stamped 12th October 2026), the agent reiterates points from the original Planning Statement (Document 09 date stamped 18th May 2026). Specifically, they state that the chosen site ensures optimal biosecurity and minimises excavation works. They also reiterate that the proposal represents a significant financial investment critical to the continued viability and expansion of the agricultural holding. These commercial and operational matters are addressed separately in the Committee Report circulated earlier to Members. Furthermore, while the agent claims that RSPCA ranging standards for hens dictated the alternative siting, they have failed to demonstrate why the lands adjacent to the existing Collin Road buildings were discounted on these grounds.

Finally, the agent lists six (6) planning precedents where remotely sited buildings were allegedly accepted. However, the individual context of each planning application has not been presented, and it is acknowledged that none of the cited planning references were assessed under relevant policies within the ANPS. As such, these references carry no weight and cannot be relied upon in the assessment of the current planning application.

In conclusion, it is considered the proposal remains contrary to the policy provisions of the SPPS and DM 4.1, DM 4.3 and Policy DM 37 of the ANPS.

CONCLUSION

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

- The principle of the development is not considered acceptable;
- The scale, massing, design and appearance of the proposal are considered acceptable;
- The proposal will not unduly affect the privacy or amenity of neighbouring properties;
- Insufficient information has been provided on the method and location of litter disposal;
- It has not been demonstrated that the proposal will not have a detrimental impact on trees or the environmental quality of the area;
- Access arrangements will not prejudice road safety; and
- There will be no significant adverse impact on surface water flooding.

RECOMMENDATION	**REFUSE PLANNING PERMISSION**

PROPOSED REASON FOR REFUSAL

1. The proposal is contrary to the provisions of Paragraph 6.73 of the Strategic Planning Policy Statement and criterion (c) of DM 4.1 of the Antrim and Newtownabbey Plan Strategy in that the development is not sited beside existing farm buildings and there is no overriding reason for the siting away from the existing buildings.

2. The proposal is contrary to the provisions of Paragraph 6.73 of the Strategic Planning Policy Statement and DM 4.3 of the Antrim and Newtownabbey Plan Strategy in that it has not been sufficiently demonstrated that the alternative site away from the existing buildings on the farm holding is essential for the efficient functioning of the farm business, that there are demonstrable environmental or health and safety grounds to substantiate this, or that there is a need to protect the amenity of nearby residents.

3. The proposal is contrary to the provisions of paragraph 6.192 of the Strategic Planning Policy Statement and Policy DM 37 of the ANPS in that it has not been demonstrated that the proposal will not have a detrimental impact on designated sites in England/Wales, as no information has been provided with regards to the specific end location and use of the poultry litter.

Reviewed by Senior Planning Officer – Johanne McKendry 14/10/2026

Reviewed by Deputy Director of Planning – Barry Diamond 15/10/2026

Reviewed By Director of Planning and Economic Development – Majella McAlister and Date

In reviewing this report, the officers above have confirmed that they have no perceived or confirmed conflict of interest.

COMMITTEE ITEM	**3.12**
APPLICATION NO	**LA03/2026/0366/F**
DEA	**DUNSILLY**
COMMITTEE INTEREST	**ADDENDUM TO COMMITTEE REPORT**
RECOMMENDATION	**REFUSE PLANNING PERMISSION**
PROPOSAL	Proposed erection of two agricultural sheds with proposed new access lane
SITE/LOCATION	20m east of Nos. 4-6 Cranfield Corner, Cranfield Road, Randalstown, BT41 3LJ
APPLICANT	Donna Hodge
AGENT	Slemish Design Studio Architects
LAST SITE VISIT	22nd July 2026
CASE OFFICER	Alice Gallagher Tel: 028 903 40424 Email: alice.gallagher@antrimandnewtownabbey.gov.uk

The full details of this application, including the application forms, relevant drawings, consultation responses and any representations made are available to view at the Northern Ireland Planning Portal
https://planningregister.planningsystemni.gov.uk/application/703470

ASSESSMENT OF PLANNING ISSUES/MATERIAL CONSIDERATIONS

Following the publication of the Planning Committee Report, the applicant and their representatives submitted emails on 16th October 2026 requesting that the application be deferred. Additionally, an amended Site Location Plan (Drawing No. 01/2 date stamped 16th October 2026) was submitted which included visibility splays of 2.0m x 60m, as requested by DfI Roads.

As the principle of development has not been established at this location and due to the concerns relating to urban sprawl, it is not considered necessary to defer the application. The sight splays are in accordance with DfI Roads requirements, therefore, the reason for refusal on road safety grounds (No. 3) has now been removed.

In conclusion, it is considered the proposal remains contrary to the policy provisions of the SPPS, SP1.11, SP1.13 and DM 4.1 of the Antrim and Newtownabbey Plan Strategy.

CONCLUSION

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

- The principle of development has not been established as it has not been demonstrated that there are no other buildings available on the holding that can be used to meet the operational need and the proposed sheds are not sited beside existing farm buildings;
- The proposed sheds could not integrate into the surrounding area as they would contribute to urban sprawl and are not agricultural in nature;
- It is considered that mitigation measures could be put in place so as not to compromise the amenity of neighbouring residents;
- It is considered that mitigation measures could be put in place so as not to compromise natural heritage;
- There are no road safety concerns; and

- There is no flood risk associated with the proposed development.

RECOMMENDATION	**REFUSE PLANNING PERMISSION**

PROPOSED REASONS FOR REFUSAL

1. The proposal is contrary to the provisions contained in the Strategic Planning Policy Statement paragraph 6.73 and fails to meet the provisions of Policies SP1.11 and DM 4.1 of the Antrim and Newtownabbey Plan Strategy in that the proposed development does not comply with criterion (a) of DM 4.1 as it has not been demonstrated that the buildings are necessary for the efficient operation of the farm holding, and criterion (b) of DM 4.1 as it has not been demonstrated that there are no other buildings available on the holding that can be used to meet the operational need, and criterion (c) of DM 4.1 in that the proposal is not sited beside existing farm buildings.

2. The proposal is contrary to the provisions contained in the Strategic Planning Policy Statement paragraph 6.73 and fails to meet the provisions of Policies SP1.11 and SP 1.13 of the Antrim and Newtownabbey Plan Strategy in that the proposal would result in urban sprawl and erode the character of the countryside.

Reviewed by Senior Planning Officer – Johanne McKendry 16/10/2026

Reviewed by Deputy Director of Planning – Barry Diamond 16th October 2026

Reviewed By Director of Planning and Economic Development – Majella McAlister and Date

In reviewing this report, the officers above have confirmed that they have no perceived or confirmed conflict of interest.

COMMITTEE ITEM	**3.13 ADDENDUM**
APPLICATION NO	**LA03/2026/0517/F**
DEA	**BALLYCLARE**
COMMITTEE INTEREST	**ADDENDUM TO COMMITTEE REPORT**
RECOMMENDATION	**REFUSE PLANNING PERMISSION**
PROPOSAL	Retention of boundary fence
SITE/LOCATION	4 Highgrove Avenue, Ballyclare, BT39 9XL
APPLICANT	David Beattie
AGENT	Andy McDowell Design
LAST SITE VISIT	25/08/2026
CASE OFFICER	Michael Glynn Tel: 028 903 40411 Email: Michael.glynn@antrimandnewtownabbey.gov.uk

The full details of this application, including the application forms, relevant drawings, consultation responses and any representations made are available to view at the Northern Ireland Planning Portal
https://planningregister.planningsystemni.gov.uk/application/711308

ASSESSMENT OF PLANNING ISSUES/MATERIAL CONSIDERATIONS

Following the publicaiton of the Planning Committee Report, amended plans were submitted to reduce the height of the existing close-boarded fence from 2.1m to 1.8m, as shown on the revised Fence Elevations Plan (Drawing No. 03/1, date stamped 14th October 2026). The overall length of the fence remains unchanged, extending 20.4m along Doagh Road.

Whilst the 0.3m height reduction is acknowledged and ensures the proposed fence matches the existing boundary fence at No. 2 Highgrove Drive, the amendment fails to address the concerns previously identified in the Planning Committee Report.

It is noted that the subject fence sits immediately adjacent to a 1.8m high roadside boundary fence at No. 2 Highgrove, which extends approximately 6.7m along the Doagh Road. Although the neighbouring fence does not benefit from planning permission, it has been in situ for over five years and is therefore immune from enforcement action.

Even at a reduced height of 1.8m, the subject fence would still span a continuous length of approximately 20.4m. When read in conjunction with the established fence at No. 2 Highgrove Avenue, the development creates an extensive, combined, and uninterrupted expanse of fencing that is visually dominant and highly incongruous within the street scene.

Due to the excessive cumulative length of 27.1m and its prominent roadside location, the structure represents an unduly dominant and visually intrusive feature that fails to respect the scale, form, or character of the host dwelling. Consequently, the proposal continues to exert an adverse impact on the character and appearance of the area, remaining contrary to the design and placemaking objectives of the relevant planning policy.

In conclusion, it is considered that the previous concerns outlined in the Planning Committee Report have not been addressed and it is considered the proposal fails to align with the policy provisions of the Strategic Planning Policy Statement and Policies SP4 and DM 22 of the Antrim and Newtownabbey Local Development Plan.
CONCLUSION
The following is a summary of the main reasons for the recommendation: • The principle of development is considered acceptable; • The subject development is considered unacceptable in terms of scale, massing, design and appearance; • There are no issues with neighbour amenity, impacts on trees and environmental quality of this area; and • The subject development is not considered to negatively impact private amenity space, parking and manoeuvring.

RECOMMENDATION	**REFUSE PLANNING PERMISSION**

1. The proposal is contrary to the policy provisions of the Strategic Planning Policy Statement and Policy SP 4 and Policy DM 22 of the Antrim and Newtownabbey Plan Strategy, in that the scale, massing, design and external materials of the proposal are not sympathetic to the existing property and detract from the appearance and character of the surrounding area.

Reviewed by Senior Planning Officer – Johanne McKendry 15/10/2026

Reviewed by Deputy Director of Planning – Barry Diamond and 15th October 2026

Reviewed By Director of Planning and Economic Development – Majella McAlister and Date

In reviewing this report, the officers above have confirmed that they have no perceived or confirmed conflict of interest.

COMMITTEE ITEM	**3.15 ADDENDUM**
APPLICATION NO	**LA03/2026/0474/F**
DEA	**GLENGORMLEY URBAN**
COMMITTEE INTEREST	**ADDENDUM TO COMMITTEE REPORT**
RECOMMENDATION	**REFUSE PLANNING PERMISSION**
PROPOSAL	Retention of deck area
SITE/LOCATION	23 Kirkdale, Newtownabbey, BT36 5BX
APPLICANT	Joseph Osbourne
AGENT	JWM Planning Limited
LAST SITE VISIT	25/08/2026
CASE OFFICER	Michael Glynn Tel: 028 903 40411 Email: Michael.glynn@antrimandnewtownabbey.gov.uk

The full details of this application, including the application forms, relevant drawings, consultation responses and any representations made are available to view at the Northern Ireland Planning Portal
https://planningregister.planningsystemni.gov.uk/application/711156

ASSESSMENT OF PLANNING ISSUES/MATERIAL CONSIDERATIONS

Following the publication of the Planning Committee Report, a revised scheme was submitted on 13th October 2026. This submission included an amended Site Layout Plan (Drawing No. 02/1) and an amended Elevations Plan (Drawing No. 03/1), both date-stamped 13th October 2026.

The revised proposal replaces the existing deck steps on the southwestern elevation of the raised decking with a new stepped access on the northeastern elevation. The amended plans also introduce a 1.8m-high privacy barrier along the southeastern, southwestern, and northwestern edges of the raised decking. Whilst the overall height is 1.8m, the elevations show a split design which includes a lower open balustrade up to 1m, with the solid, close-boarded screening restricted to the upper section between 1m and 1.8m above deck level.

Whilst the proposed screening would partially reduce direct overlooking, the open balustrade at the base of the barrier fails to provide adequate privacy**.** Due to the elevated position of the decking, clear views into neighbouring rear gardens would remain achievable through this lower section, particularly for seated occupants. Consequently, the revised design fails to fully mitigate overlooking or prevent a detrimental loss of privacy for the residents of Nos. 21 and 25 Kirkdale and the adverse impacts on neighbouring residential amenity have not been satisfactorily overcome.

Following publication of the amended plans, an additional letter of objection was received. The objector states that the revised proposal fails to adequately address the previous concerns of overlooking and loss of privacy. It is further stated that the proposed privacy barrier appears to be positioned on top of the existing open-spindle balustrade and would not provide effective screening for users seated on the decking. The objector also raises concerns regarding the lack of technical detail provided on the submitted drawings, specifically whether the proposed privacy barrier would comprise an open or closed design. The objector considers that a

continuous, fully enclosed screen with a minimum height of 1.8 metres, measured from deck level, is necessary to provide an acceptable level of privacy.

It is considered the amendments reduce but do not eliminate overlooking opportunities from the raised decking area and the revised scheme fails to overcome the reason for refusal. As such, the recommendation remains to refuse planning permission.

CONCLUSION

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

- The principle of development is considered acceptable;
- The proposal is considered acceptable in terms of siting, scale, massing and appearance;
- The proposal is considered unacceptable in terms of neighbour amenity;
- The proposal is not considered to result in adverse impacts on trees and the environmental quality of the area;
- The proposal is not considered to negatively impact amenity space, or parking and manoeuvring; and
- The proposal is not considered to have a significant adverse impact as a result of surface water flooding.

RECOMMENDATION	**REFUSE PLANNING PERMISSION**

PROPOSED REASON FOR REFUSAL

1. The proposal is contrary to paragraph 4.12 of the SPPS, Policy DM 22 and Policy DM 28 of the Antrim and Newtownabbey Plan Strategy, in that the design of the proposal will result in a detrimental impact on the privacy and amenity of the neighbouring residents at Nos. 21 and 25 Kirkdale by way of overlooking and loss of privacy.

Reviewed by Senior Planning Officer – Johanne McKendry 15/10/2026

Reviewed by Deputy Director of Planning – Barry Diamond and 15th October 2026

Reviewed By Director of Planning and Economic Development – Majella McAlister and Date

In reviewing this report, the officers above have confirmed that they have no perceived or confirmed conflict of interest.

COMMITTEE ITEM	**3.16 ADDENDUM**
APPLICATION NO	**LA03/2025/0900/F**
DEA	**MACEDON**
COMMITTEE INTEREST	**NUMBER OF OBJECTIONS/COUNCIL LAND**
RECOMMENDATION	**GRANT RETROSPECTIVE PLANNING PERMISSION**
PROPOSAL	Retrospective application for external landscaping that includes a raised patio to the front of the dwelling, a gabion retaining structure and a replacement 2m high stained, timber, vertical palisade fence.
SITE/LOCATION	2 Fernlea Lane, Newtownabbey, BT36 6UY
APPLICANT	John Russell
AGENT	A.I.D.A Architects
LAST SITE VISIT	02/02/2026
CASE OFFICER	Michael Glynn Tel: 028 903 40411 Email: Michael.glynn@antrimandnewtownabbey.gov.uk

The full details of this application, including the application forms, relevant drawings, consultation responses and any representations made are available to view at the Northern Ireland Planning Portal
https://planningregister.planningsystemni.gov.uk/application/705172

ASSESSMENT OF PLANNING ISSUES/MATERIAL CONSIDERATIONS

Following publication of the Planning Committee Report a representation from a third party was received on 15th October 2026. The representation raised several concerns and sought clarification on a number of issues including:

- Encroachment on land and pedestrian impact;
- Council landownership and consent;
- Structural and Building Control Regulations;
- Environmental and ecological concerns; and
- Administrative consistency and record keeping.

The representation queried the width of the public walkway before and after construction of the gabion retaining wall and the effect on pedestrian access, accessibility and safety. The Planning Committee Report acknowledges that the gabion retaining wall extends onto land outside the applicant's ownership and encroaches onto lands which are part of a public walkway. The acceptability of the proposal has been assessed against relevant policy considerations, including scale, massing and design. Matters relating rights of access and occupation of third-party land are civil matters and are not material considerations in the assessment of planning applications.

The representation also queried whether the encroachment onto Council-owned land was authorised and whether the relevant Council section had been consulted. The application was amended during the assessment process to include the completion of Certificate C and evidence that notice had been served on the relevant third-party landowner, namely, Antrim and Newtownabbey Borough Council. Any forthcoming grant of planning permission does not convey any rights over land outside the applicant's ownership and does not imply consent to use or

occupy the lands. Any authorisation required from the Council as landowner is a separate matter outside the planning process.

The representation questioned the evidence relied upon to establish the application boundary and the extent of the encroachment. These matters are addressed within the "Other Matters" section of the Planning Committee Report. The submission of a boundary survey was not considered necessary for the determination of the application. Questions relating to precise legal boundaries, ownership and any alleged trespass remain civil matters.

The representation queried whether Building Control had confirmed that the retaining structure required approval. As set out in the report, Planning and Building Control operate under separate legislative regimes. Compliance with building regulations and any requirement for Building Control approval falls outside the planning assessment and is considered under separate legislation.

Clarification was also sought regarding the evidence relating to the removal of trees, including whether the trees were dead ash trees, whether removal occurred during the bird nesting season and whether protected species may have been affected. The Context Report (Document 01, date stamped 2nd December 2026) outlines that three dead ash trees were removed. No evidence was submitted to demonstrate the presence of bat roosts or other protected species within the trees. The planning assessment concluded that, having regard to the proposed replacement planting and the net increase in tree numbers, the proposal would not result in an unacceptable impact on environmental quality or biodiversity. Any alleged offence relating to protected species would be a separate matter under the Wildlife Order and would not alter the planning assessment.

The representation queried whether a planning condition should address the physical encroachment of the gabion wall onto the public walkway. As outlined above, issues relating to land ownership, occupation of third-party land and any encroachment beyond the applicant's ownership fall outside the remit of planning control and are not matters capable of being resolved through a planning condition.

Finally, the representation identified an inconsistency in drawing references. For the avoidance of doubt, the drawing assessed by the Council and referred to throughout the report is Drawing No. 02 which is date stamped 2nd December 2025.

The issues raised do not alter the assessment of the application or the conclusions reached within the officer report. The recommendation remains unchanged and is to grant retrospective planning permission, subject to the conditions set out in the report.

CONCLUSION

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

- The principle of development is considered acceptable;
- The proposal is considered acceptable in terms of scale, massing, design and appearance;
- The proposal is not considered to unduly impact the amenity of neighbouring properties;
- The proposal is not considered to result in adverse impacts on trees and environmental quality of this area; and

- The proposal is not considered to negatively impact amenity space, parking and manoeuvring.

RECOMMENDATION	**GRANT PLANNING PERMISSION**

PROPOSED CONDITIONS

1. This decision is issued under Section 55 of The Planning Act (Northern Ireland) 2011.

   Reason: This is a retrospective application.

2. Within 4 weeks of the date of this permission, Irish Ivy (Hedera hibernica) shall be planted 30–50 cm apart along the length of the base of the gabion baskets and 30–50 cm apart along the top of the gabion baskets.

   Reason: To ensure full coverage of the gabion wall and to ensure the provision, establishment and maintenance of a high standard of landscape and to ensure the development integrates into the surrounding area.

3. During the first available planting season from the date of the permission the proposed landscaping works as indicated on Drawing No. 02 date stamped 2nd December 2025 shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details and the appropriate British Standard or other recognised Codes of Practice.

   If within a period of 5 years within the lifetime of the development and from the date of the planting of any tree, shrub or hedge, that tree, shrub or hedge is removed, uprooted or destroyed or dies, or becomes, in the opinion of the Council, seriously damaged or defective, another tree, shrub or hedge of the same species and size as that originally planted shall be planted at the same place, unless the Council gives its written consent to any variation.

   Reason: To ensure the provision, establishment and maintenance of a high standard of landscape.

Reviewed by Senior Planning Officer – Johanne McKendry and Date

Reviewed by Head of Planning – Barry Diamond and Date

Reviewed by Deputy Director of Planning – Sharon Mossman and Date

Reviewed By Director of Planning and Economic Development – Majella McAlister and Date

In reviewing this report, the officers above have confirmed that they have no perceived or confirmed conflict of interest.

COMMITTEE ITEM	**3.17 ADDENDUM**
APPLICATION NO	**LA03/2026/0328/A**
DEA	**AIRPORT**
COMMITTEE INTEREST	**ADDENDUM TO COMMITTEE REPORT**
RECOMMENDATION	**REFUSE ADVERTISEMENT CONSENT**
PROPOSAL	1 No. Hoarding
SITE/LOCATION	Lands 253 metres southwest of No. 1 Ballymartin Road, Templepatrick, Ballyclare, BT39 0BW
APPLICANT	Bauer Media Outdoor LTD
AGENT	Applicant is the Agent
LAST SITE VISIT	3rd July 2026
CASE OFFICER	Michael Glynn Tel: 028 903 40411 Email: Michael.glynn@antrimandnewtownabbey.gov.uk

The full details of this application, including the application forms, relevant drawings, consultation responses and any representations made are available to view at the Northern Ireland Planning Portal
https://planningregister.planningsystemni.gov.uk/application/710533

ASSESSMENT OF PLANNING ISSUES/MATERIAL CONSIDERATIONS

Following publication of the Planning Committee Report, the agent submitted additional supporting information on 15th October 2026, including a Contextual Analysis (Document 01, date stamped 15th October 2026), a Letter of Deferral (Document 02, date stamped 15th October 2026) and a letter of support from Translink, dated 15th October 2026.

The Contextual Analysis (Document 01, date stamped 15th October 2026) provides street imagery of the proposed advertisement hoarding within its immediate surroundings. Whilst the site is located adjacent to existing transport and road infrastructure associated with the Ballymartin Park and Ride facility, the proposal remains a substantial freestanding advertisement structure located on an undeveloped site within the open countryside. This additional Contextual Analysis (Document 01, date stamped 15th October 2026) does not alter the conclusion that the proposal would constitute a prominent and visually intrusive feature which would detract from the rural character of the area and contribute to visual clutter.

The agent states in the Letter of Deferral (Document 02, date stamped 15th October 2026) that the site should be assessed as part of an established transport corridor rather than as an isolated rural location. However, notwithstanding the presence of surrounding transport infrastructure, the site remains located within the countryside where particular care must be exercised in respect of advertisements, in accordance with Annex A of PPS 17. The proposal is not related to premises on which it is displayed and would introduce a prominent commercial advertising feature into the countryside. The additional information submitted does not overcome this policy objection.

The submission also includes a letter of support from Translink confirming that advertising revenue generated by the proposal would be reinvested into public transport infrastructure. Whilst this is noted, the control of advertisements is exercised

in the interests of amenity and public safety. The potential financial benefit arising from the advertisement does not outweigh the identified harm to visual amenity and does not alter the policy assessment.

A request has been made to defer the application to facilitate further consideration of the submitted material. The Planning Section is satisfied that sufficient information is presently available to determine the application and the submitted additional information does not raise any new material planning considerations that would warrant a deferral.

CONCLUSION

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

- The location of the signage in the countryside is unacceptable;
- The proposal will detract from the character and appearance of the area.
- Neighbour amenity will not be unduly affected by the proposal; and
- There are no road safety concerns.

RECOMMENDATION	**REFUSE PLANNING PERMISSION**

PROPOSED REASON FOR REFUSAL

1. The proposed advertisement hoarding, by reason of its scale, siting and prominent location within the open countryside, would be an intrusive feature that would detract from the visual amenity and rural character of the area and create unnecessary visual clutter. The proposal is therefore contrary to criteria (a), (b) and (d) of DM 29.1 of the ANPS and DM 29.3 of the ANPS in that the proposal fails to comply with the guidance contained within Annex A of PPS 17: Control of Outdoor Advertisements.

Reviewed by Senior Planning Officer – Johanne McKendry 19/10/2026

Reviewed by Head of Planning – Barry Diamond and Date

Reviewed by Deputy Director of Planning – Sharon Mossman and Date

Reviewed By Director of Planning and Economic Development – Majella McAlister and Date

In reviewing this report, the officers above have confirmed that they have no perceived or confirmed conflict of interest.