

<b>COMMITTEE ITEM</b>	<b>3.8</b>
<b>APPLICATION NO</b>	<b>LA03/2025/0238/F</b>
<b>DEA</b>	<b>AIRPORT</b>
<b>COMMITTEE INTEREST</b>	<b>REFUSAL RECOMMENDED</b>
<b>RECOMMENDATION</b>	<b>REFUSE PLANNING PERMISSION</b>
<b>PROPOSAL</b>	Extension and alterations to dwelling
<b>SITE/LOCATION</b>	89 Temple Hall, Templepatrick, BT39 0FE
<b>APPLICANT</b>	Laura Lismore
<b>AGENT</b>	Galvin Architecture
<b>LAST SITE VISIT</b>	08/05/2025
<b>CASE OFFICER</b>	Michael Glynn Tel: 028 903 40411 Email: <a href="mailto:Michael.glynn@antrimandnewtownabbey.gov.uk">Michael.glynn@antrimandnewtownabbey.gov.uk</a>

**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/698472>**

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

Following circulation of the Planning Committee report, an amended scheme was received which included amended elevations and floor plans, Drawing No. 02/1 date stamped 30th June 2025, which attempts to address overlooking concerns, as well as a supporting Planning Statement, Document 01/1 date stamped 17th July 2025, which aims to address how the proposal aligns with the policies contained within the Council's Plan Strategy 2030. Both are discussed in detail below.

The Planning Statement ascertains that the proposal, which includes the conversion of the existing roof space to provide additional living accommodation and construction of a dormer extension on the side elevation to facilitate access to and use of the new roof space area, complies with the policy context set out in the Plan Strategy.

The Statement indicates the proposal complies with Policy SP 1 as it utilises the existing dwelling to meet the applicant's needs without requiring additional land or new housing. However, SP 1.2 goes on to state that planning applications that accord with the provisions of the Local Development Plan (LDP) will be approved, unless material considerations indicate otherwise. In this case, the policy context regarding homes is set out within Policies SP 4, and DM 22 which relates to residential extensions and alterations (and DM 22.2 indicates that the Council will take account of the guidance set out in Appendix B of the Plan Strategy).

The Statement sets out that in line with Policy SP6, the dormer extension, has been amended to minimise any potential for overlooking, is subordinate in scale to the host dwelling as its walls and roof remain below the existing ridge line and do not project beyond the existing verges. It states that the dormer has been carefully designed to ensure that the extension integrates sensitively and architecturally with the character of the dwelling, with all proposed materials sympathetic to the surrounding context.

The amended scheme, as indicated on the revised Elevations and Floor Plan, Drawing No. 02/1, removes the proposed windows on the northern elevation of the proposed box dormer and replaces them with two narrow high-level windows which are 1.7m above the finished floor level of the roof conversion and have a height of 0.4m and a width of 1.5m. Due to the height of the proposed high-level windows views into the neighbouring property at No. 87 Temple Hall are prevented. As such, it is considered the initial concerns regarding overlooking have been mitigated by the amended design. Nonetheless, the size, scale and location of the proposed dormer remains as previously proposed, with an approximate length of 9.9m, a width of 2.7m and a height of 2.7m.

B14 –17 of Annex B of the Plan Strategy refers to roof extensions and B16 indicates a dormer roof extension should be designed in a manner that complements the period and style of the original property. In this case the proposed dormer is finished in vertical composite cladding which is not a feature on the existing host dwelling and not a common theme throughout the residential development of Temple Hall.

Under Policy B16, a roof extension should complement the period and style of the original property. The proposed dormer, finished in vertical composite cladding, introduces a material that is not present on the host dwelling nor commonly used throughout the Temple Hall development. This results in a visual inconsistency that detracts from the character of the dwelling and surrounding area. Whilst the agent contends that the flat-roof design and use of trocal roofing minimise visual clutter and are acceptable due to limited visibility from public viewpoints, Policy B17 makes clear that the visual impact of dormers must also be assessed in relation to the established character of the residential development, not solely on public visibility. In this case, however, the dormer is visible from within the internal estate roads of Temple Hall.

The Planning Statement states that the host dwelling is not visible from the public road, however, as stated previously, the proposal will be visible from public vantage points along the internal estate roads of Temple Hall. Furthermore, B17 indicates when a dormer is open to public view, dormer windows to the front or side of a property will be resisted in areas where they are uncharacteristic, particularly large box dormers that are over-dominant often extending the full width of the roof. The size and number of dormers should therefore be kept to a minimum to avoid dominating the appearance of the roof and should be located below the ridge line of the existing roof. In this case a side dormer is proposed which is approximately 9.9m in length, which is considered overly dominant to the appearance of the host dwelling and will negatively interfere with the street scene. As the proposal is a large box dormer to the side of the host dwelling and visible when travelling in both directions along the internal estate road, it is considered unacceptable as it has an unbalanced appearance and is considered out of character with the host dwelling and the general character of the area.

In summary, the amended scheme has reduced the impact of overlooking towards No. 87 Temple Hall by implementing high level windows which will not achieve critical views from the proposal. However, the location and scale of the proposed dormer remain uncharacteristic to the surrounding context, and the dormer is considered to detract from the character and appearance of the area.

The Planning Statement concludes by stating that the development proposal attracted no objections and that the proposal addresses a genuine local family need, which stems from the applicant's growing family and the limited availability of appropriately sized housing in the immediate area. Rather than relocating, the applicant wishes to remain in Templepatrick, close to their elderly parents who reside approximately 300 metres away, as well as to extended family members, all of whom live within the Temple Hall development.

Although the circumstances outlined above are acknowledged, it has not been sufficiently evidenced how genuine hardship would be caused if planning permission were refused, and as such is not determining in this case.

In conclusion, as the overlooking concerns have been mitigated, this has been removed from the refusal reason. However, the remainder of the matters formally raised within the refusal reason remains unchanged.

### **CONCLUSION**

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

- The principle of development is considered acceptable;
- The proposal is considered unacceptable 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;
- The proposal is not considered to negatively impact amenity space, parking and manoeuvring.

### **RECOMMENDATION**

### **REFUSE PLANNING PERMISSION**

### **PROPOSED REASON FOR REFUSAL**

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 Local Development Plan, 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.

<b>COMMITTEE ITEM</b>	<b>3.6</b>
<b>APPLICATION NO</b>	<b>LA03/2025/0187/O</b>
<b>DEA</b>	<b>AIRPORT</b>
<b>COMMITTEE INTEREST</b>	<b>ADDENDUM TO COMMITTEE REPORT</b>
<b>RECOMMENDATION</b>	<b>REFUSE OUTLINE PLANNING PERMISSION</b>
<b>PROPOSAL</b>	Site for replacement dwelling
<b>SITE/LOCATION</b>	41 Loanends road, Nutts corner, Crumlin, BT29 4YW
<b>APPLICANT</b>	Raymond McAuley
<b>AGENT</b>	Architectural Design Services
<b>LAST SITE VISIT</b>	21st May 2025
<b>CASE OFFICER</b>	Eleanor McCann Tel: 028 90340422 Email: <a href="mailto:Eleanor.mccann@antrimandnewtownabbey.gov.uk">Eleanor.mccann@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/application/699088">https://planningregister.planningsystemni.gov.uk/application/699088</a></b></p>	
<b>ADDENDUM TO COMMITTEE REPORT</b>	
<p>Following completion of the Planning Committee report, the agent submitted a Biodiversity Checklist and Bat Roost Potential Survey, Document 02 and an Existing House Analysis, Drawing No. 02, both date stamped 30th June 2025.</p> <p>The Biodiversity Checklist indicated that the building to be replaced has moderate bat roost and foraging potential and an Active Bat Survey will be required. It went on to state that the subject building and hedgerows within the application site have bird nest potential and recommends that a search for hedgehog E. Europeaeus day nests should be carried out to avoid death or injury.</p> <p>The Bat Roost Potential Survey indicated that the building to be replaced has roof crevices with moderate bat access and roosting potential and there is nearby moderate potential bat foraging habitat. The Survey went on to state that any hedgerow removal of 20m or more must be compensated by replacement planting with a native species hedgerow. It also stated that there must be no changes to the site until an active bat detector survey has been completed by a suitably qualified ecologist.</p> <p>Further bat surveys were not requested to avoid undue costs to the applicant as the principal of development has not been established in that the building to be replaced does not exhibit the essential characteristics of a dwelling and as a minimum does not have all its external structural walls substantially intact. Therefore, Refusal Reason 3 remains unchanged.</p> <p>The Existing House Analysis, Drawing No. 02 date stamped 30th June 2025, provides photographs and information relating to the building to be replaced and aims to address the Council's concerns with regards to the building not exhibiting the essential characteristics of a dwelling, and having all its external walls substantially intact.</p> <p>The Existing House Analysis, Drawing 02, includes an historical photograph, entitled 'Original aerial photo showing number 41 and number 43', which shows No. 41</p>	

Loanends Road (the subject building to be replaced) and the dwelling adjacent, which is known as No. 43 Loanends Road, attached to No. 41. The notations on the photo indicate that a rear porch, a front projection to the front serving a kitchen and a chimney present on No. 41, have been removed.

The Existing House Analysis, Drawing 02 also include a number of more recently taken photographs. The photograph labelled 'Original front elevation' notates that the original party wall between Nos. 41 IS still intact but is now attached to the dwelling at No. 43 as the two dwellings became detached at the time the dwelling at No. 43 was renovated, It is also notated on the photograph that the original chimney opening in the roof is still intact, and refers to the original internal plaster from the kitchen area, the old kitchen doorway and the original windows being intact.

The photograph labelled 'Original rear elevation' notated that No. 43 is a renovated structure with all original walls as per the aerial photo. The photograph also noted the original party wall between Nos. 41 and 43 is still intact and indicates that an original doorway, an original window reveal, the original internal plaster from the previous porch area and an original window are all intact.

Further photographs on the plan depict an original chimney opening in the roof taken from inside the building still intact, original window features remaining, original paint on the walls, part of a wall collapsed whilst installing drainage as well as a photo of an electricity bill addressed to the applicant at No. 41 Loanends Road.

As a consequence of submission of the information referred to above, it is recognised, that there is some evidence of some essential characteristics of a dwelling present within the building to be replaced. However, the concern remains that all external walls are not substantially intact. As noted on the photograph labelled 'part of walls collapsed installing drainage' a portion of the wall along the front elevation and a portion of the rear elevation wall, which would have connected the subject building and the dwelling at No. 43 Loanends Road, is missing. This is also evident by the presence of an overhanging roof and a window on the rear elevation of the subject building, which is evident in the historical photograph, now not being present on the current rear elevation. Additionally, the agent contends that the original party wall between Nos. 41 and 43 Loanends Road is still intact, however, this forms the gable elevation of No. 43 Loanends Road and is therefore missing on the northwestern gable elevation of No. 41.

The Existing House Analysis, Drawing 02, includes a 'Structural Wall Calculation' which indicates that the total external wall area is 94.07sqm, the wall area which has been removed is 8.1sqm and that the total wall area remaining is 85.97sqm and therefore 91.4% of all external walls are fully intact. Although Policy DM 18B does not specify what is meant by 'substantially intact, DM 18.7 when mentioning that 'as a minimum, all external walls are substantially intact' it refers to Figure 8, which is a drawing of a dwelling without a roof but has all walls on four sides present, which the subject building does not.

In conclusion the Council's concern that all external walls of the building to be replaced are not substantially intact are still upheld and therefore the proposal is contrary to the policy provisions of the Strategic Planning Policy Statement and

Policies SP 1 and DM 18b of the Council's Plan Strategy, in that the building to be replaced as a minimum not all the external structural walls are substantially intact.

**RECOMMENDATION**

**REFUSE PLANNING PERMISSION**

**PROPOSED REASONS FOR REFUSAL**

1. The proposal is contrary to the policy provisions of the Strategic Planning Policy Statement and Policies SP 1 and DM 18 of the Council's Plan Strategy, in that there are no overriding reasons why the proposal is essential in a countryside location and could not be located within a settlement.
2. The proposal is contrary to the policy provisions of the Strategic Planning Policy Statement and Policies SP 1 and DM 18B of the Council's Plan Strategy, in that the building to be replaced as a minimum not all the external structural walls are substantially intact.
3. The proposal is contrary to the policy provisions of the Strategic Planning Policy Statement and Policies SP 1, SP 8, DM 38 and DM 39 of the Council's Plan Strategy, in that insufficient information has been provided to demonstrate that the proposal would not negatively impact upon designated sites, priority habitats, protected species and other features of biodiversity interest.