

Delegated Applications

Recommendations considered by Planning Committee members: Week Commencing 18th August 2025

Reference No.	Proposal	Site Location	Recommendation	Objections
LA06/2024/0516/F	Dwelling & Garage (Change of Access Arrangement approved under LA06/2023/1394/F)	40 metres north of 5 Moate Road, Comber DEA: Comber	Approval	0
LA06/2023/1952/F	Dwelling, new access & associated site works	Lands to the rear of 1 Henderson Avenue, Conlig DEA: Hollywood & Clandeboye	Approval	2
LA06/2025/0574/F	Change of use from second floor office to residential apartment	Briterome Hardware, 1-3 Hamilton Road, Bangor DEA: Bangor Central	Approval	0
LA06/2024/0594/F	Proposed replacement dwelling and garage with extended curtilage and retention of new	185 Church Road, Hollywood DEA: Hollywood & Clandeboye	Approval	0

	access and domestic stable building			
LA06/2024/0705/F	Demolition of garage and new 2 storey dwelling	113 Princetown Road, Bangor DEA: Bangor West	Refusal	1

Reasons for refusal for LA06/2024/0705/F

1. The proposal is contrary to Policy QD1 (a) of Planning Policy Statement 7; in that the proposal does not respect the surrounding context and would result in the intensification of site usage in an area which consists of large plots and is therefore inappropriate in terms of its layout and appearance. The development would be out of character with other development in the locality and would create an unwelcome precedent for other back-land development of a similar nature elsewhere in the locality.
2. The proposal is contrary to Policy LC1 (b) of the Addendum to Planning Policy Statement 7; in that the pattern of development of the proposal would not be in keeping with the overall character and environmental quality of the established residential area.
3. The proposal is contrary to Policy LC1 (a) of Planning Policy Statement 7 in that the proposed density of the development would be significantly higher than that found in the surrounding residential area.
4. The proposal is contrary to Policy QD 1 (h) of Planning Policy Statement 7 (PPS 7): *Quality Residential Environments*, in that the design and layout of the development would create conflict with adjacent land uses by resulting in unacceptable adverse effects on existing residential properties through overlooking. The proposal fails to respect the privacy of neighbouring dwellings, and as such, would result in an unacceptable loss of residential amenity.

5. The proposal is contrary to Policy QD 1 (c) of Planning Policy Statement 7: *Quality Residential Environments*, in that it fails to provide adequate private open space as an integral part of the development.
6. The proposal is contrary to policy AMP2 of Planning Policy Statement 3 (PPS 3), Access, Movement and Parking, as the intensification of use via a substandard access would prejudice the safety and convenience of road users.