

Delegated Applications

Recommendations considered by Planning Committee members: Week Commencing 22nd September 2025

Reference No.	Proposal	Site Location	Recommendation	Objections
LA06/2025/0577/F	Detached Dwelling	Side garden 16m SW of 187 Bangor Road, Seahill, Holywood DEA: Holywood and Clandeboyne	Approval	0
LA06/2024/0705/F	Demolition of garage and new 2 storey dwelling	113 Princetown Road, Bangor DEA: Bangor West	Refusal	1

LA06/2025/0279/F	Erection of 1no. dwelling and garage (proposed change of house type to site no.231, increase in curtilage, additional garage and boundary alterations to site no.232 previously approved under LA06/2015/0935/RM)	Lands approx. 160m North-East of no.42 Beverley Walk, Newtownards DEA: Ards Peninsula	Approval	0
LA06/2025/0602/F	Extension to domestic curtilage & associated landscaping (partly retrospective)	60 Tullyhubbert Road, Ballygowan DEA: Comber	Approval	0

Refusal Reasons 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 the Addendum to 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.