COMMITTEE ITEM	**3.2 ADDENDUM**
APPLICATION NO	**LA03/2026/0292/F**
DEA	**THREE MILE WATER**
COMMITTEE INTEREST	**ADDENDUM TO COMMITTEE REPORT**
RECOMMENDATION	**GRANT PLANNING PERMISSION**
PROPOSAL	Retention of replacement dwelling and garage (Retrospective change of house type from that previously approved under planning application Ref: LA03/2024/0256/F)
SITE/LOCATION	753 Shore Road, Jordanstown, Newtownabbey, BT37 0Z
APPLICANT	William Martin
AGENT	Quinn Design Associates
LAST SITE VISIT	1st June 2026
CASE OFFICER	Eleanor McCann Tel: 028 903 40422 Email: eleanor.mccann@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/709379

ASSESSMENT OF PLANNING ISSUES/MATERIAL CONSIDERATIONS

Following the publication of the Planning Committee Report, a further three letters of objection were received from neighbour notified properties. A letter of objection was received on 11th November 2026 from No. 5 Waterside View, which contained photographs of the development taken from the neighbouring properties at Waterside View.

A further letter of objection was received from No. 5 Waterside View on 11th November 2026 which stated that the documents on the Northern Ireland Planning Portal for application Ref: LA03/2024/0256/F (the previously approved replacement dwelling on the application site) did not appear to be visible and only the current proposal was available to view.

The objector at No. 5 Waterside View stated that without access to the stamped approved plans for planning approval Ref: LA03/2024/0256/F it is impossible to compare the approved drawings with the drawings submitted for the current application. The objector at No. 5 Waterside View requested that the stamped approved drawings for planning approval Ref: LA03/2024/0256/F be uploaded to the Planning Portal and for the Planning Section to confirm if the consultation/comment deadline for the current application under assessment will be extended to ensure that interested parties have a fair opportunity to review the plans approved under planning approval Ref: LA03/2024/0256/F.

Advice was subsequently provided to the objector at No. 5 Waterside View regarding accessing the previously approved plans via a telephone call and email correspondence. Officers explained that the current application seeks to retain the two-storey dwelling and attached garage as constructed on the application site. The correspondence also summarised the main design changes as outlined in the

Planning Committee Report. It was also explained that the timeframe for consultation/correspondence to be submitted would not be extended.

A further objection was submitted on behalf of the residents of both Nos. 6 and 8 Waterside View (two neighbour notified properties) which contains a document comprising email correspondence between the objectors and the Council's Planning and Legal Sections, a document comprising photographs of the dwelling as erected which were taken from the objectors' properties at Nos. 6 and 8 Waterside View and a document setting out the objectors' concerns with the development proposal, including their inability to access the stamped approved drawings of the original planning approval for the replacement dwelling under planning application Ref: LA03/2024/0256/F. Subsequently, via a telephone call the objectors at Nos. 6 and 8 Waterside View were advised how to access the stamped approved drawings relating to the original grant of planning permission.

The objectors at Nos. 6 and 8 Waterside View in their joint email raised several concerns regarding residential amenity, including loss of light, proximity of the constructed dwelling to neighbouring dwellings, wind tunnelling, overshadowing, dominance and outlook form their properties, which were raised in earlier letters of objection. The objectors at Nos. 6 and 8 Waterside View noted that Creating Places: Achieving Quality in Residential Environments emphasises ensuring new residential developments respect their context, protect residential amenity, and contribute positively to their surroundings and raised concerns that a proper and full residential amenity assessment was not undertaken. However, these concerns have been fully considered and addressed within the Planning Committee report.

The objectors at Nos. 6 and 8 Waterside View also raised concerns regarding the proposal and the findings of the Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA). They noted that the HRA recommends adopting a precautionary approach when increasing the size and economic value of assets in locations vulnerable to environmental impacts. They argued that this is relevant because the current application seeks retrospective approval for significant changes to the dwelling approved under planning Ref: LA03/2024/0256/F, and expressed concern that neither the proposed changes nor their long-term implications within a coastal setting have been fully assessed. However, as stated in the Planning Committee Report, the footprint of the proposal does not increase under this application and as such, the development is not considered to result in any increased environmental impact upon designated sites and their site selection features.

The objectors at Nos. 6 and 8 Waterside View also raised concerns regarding flood risk and its potential impact on existing residents. Specifically, they highlighted issues relating to surface water movement and drainage, the effect of raising land levels within the floodplain, and the potential displacement of floodwater increasing flood risk to neighbouring properties. They noted that DfI Rivers has identified the site as lying within the 1-in-200-year coastal floodplain and considers the proposal contrary to Policy DM 46 of the ANPS unless an exception applies. Given the floodplain location and the growing importance of climate resilience, the objectors argued that relying on no net increase in hardstanding does not provide sufficient justification for a departure from Policy DM 46 of the ANPS. However, as stated in the Planning Committee Report, the change of house type does not increase the area of hardstanding beyond what was previously approved under planning approval Ref: LA03/2024/0256/F, for which a Flood Risk Assessment was submitted and considered

by DfI Rivers. Accordingly, the proposal is not considered to increase the flood risk and is deemed acceptable in this instance.

The objectors at Nos. 6 and 8 Waterside View also raised concerns regarding the reliance on the previous approval (planning Ref: LA03/2024/0256/F), noting that the Planning Committee Report places considerable weight on the fact that the dwelling as constructed is not significantly different from the approved scheme. They argued that the principal issue is whether the building as erected is acceptable in its own right. However, the current application benefits from a legitimate fallback position established by the previous grant of planning permission for a replacement dwelling on the application site (Ref: LA03/2024/0256/F). As previously stated, an increase of 0.7m in the ridge height of the dwelling, an increase of 0.4m in the ridge height of the garage, and a reduction in the overall footprint are not considered to significantly alter the development or adversely impact neighbouring properties. Whilst it is acknowledged that this application is assessed on its own merits, the fallback position afforded by planning approval Ref: LA03/2024/0256/F remains a material consideration in the assessment.

The objectors at Nos. 6 and 8 Waterside View also noted that, during the assessment of planning approval Ref: LA03/2024/0256/F, NI Water reported that the local sewerage network was operating at capacity and advised that any replacement dwelling should be no larger than the existing property. However, NI Water was consulted on the current application and responded with no objections, subject to standard conditions and informatives.

The objectors at Nos. 6 and 8 Waterside View also noted that a separate application, which is due to be considered, seeks approval for a five-car parking area and an additional structure adjacent to their boundary fence, arguing that it should not be assessed in isolation. However, the five-car parking area and additional structure do not form part of the current application and cannot be assessed within this determination.

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 are considered acceptable;
- The proposal will not unduly affect the privacy or 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 of the property for recreational and domestic purposes;
- Parking provision levels are considered acceptable;
- The development is not considered to have detrimental impact on flooding on the application site or surrounding the application site; and
- Other matters raised have been addressed.

RECOMMENDATION	**GRANT PLANNING PERMISSION**

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

Reason: This is a retrospective application.

2. Prior to the occupation of the dwelling hereby permitted the windows coloured purple on the gable elevations marked north and south on Drawing No. 03/1 date stamped 3rd August 2026 shall be finished in obscured glazing and shall thereafter be permanently retained.

   Reason: In the interests of residential amenity.

3. The existing natural screenings of this site as shown on approved Drawing No. 02/1 date stamped received 27th May 2026 shall be retained for the lifetime of the development unless necessary to prevent danger to the public in which case a full explanation along with a scheme for compensatory planting shall be given to the Council in writing prior to their removal. Existing hedging shall be retained at a minimum height of 2 metres and existing trees as shown retained at a minimum height of 6 metres.

   If any retained tree or vegetation is removed, uprooted or destroyed; or dies it shall be replaced within the next planting season by another tree, trees or vegetation in the same location of a species and size as specified by the Council.

   Reason: To ensure the maintenance of screening to the site and to ensure that the proposed development does not prejudice the appearance of the locality.

4. Within 3 months of the date of this permission or during the first planting season, whichever is the earliest, the proposed landscaping works as indicated on Drawing No. 02/1 date stamped 27th May 2026 shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details and the appropriate British Standard or other recognised Codes of Practice prior to the occupation of the dwelling.

   If within the lifetime of the development following 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 within the next available full planting season, unless the Council gives its written consent to any variation.

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

5. Occupation of the development hereby approved shall not take place on-site until the method of sewage disposal has been agreed in writing with Northern Ireland Water (NIW) or a Consent to Discharge has been granted under the terms of the Water (NI) Order 1999.

   Reason: To ensure a practical solution to sewage disposal is possible at this site.

6. The building shall be provided with such sanitary pipework, foul drainage and rainwater drainage as may be necessary for the hygienic and adequate disposal of foul water and rainwater separately from that building. The drainage system should also be designed to minimise the risk of wrongly connecting the sewage system to the rainwater drainage system once the building is occupied.

   Reason: In order to decrease the risk of the incorrect diversion of sewage to drains carrying rain/surface water to a waterway.

Reviewed by Senior Planning Officer – Johanne McKendry 13/11/2026
Reviewed by Deputy Director of Planning – Barry Diamond 13th November 2026
Reviewed By Director of Planning and Economic Development –

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