Planning Appeals Commission

Appeal Decisions

4th Floor
92 Ann Street
BELFAST
BT1 3HH
T: 028 9024 4710
E: info@pacni.gov.uk

Appeal Reference:	2025/A0105 (Appeal A)
Appeal by:	Kelly Houses Ltd
Appeal against:	The refusal of full planning permission.
Proposed Development:	Amended site layout for 12 Ballymullan Manor (Plot 7 of approval LA05/2017/0909/F) and erection of 13 dwellings with associated road, open space, landscaping and site works.
Location:	12 Ballymullan Manor and Land north of 5-13 Plantation Mews and East of 24-59 Mount Royal, Lisburn.
Planning Authority:	Lisburn and Castlereagh City Council
Application Reference:	LA05/2022/0842/F
Procedure:	Written representations and Commissioner's site visit on 17th April 2026
Decision by:	Commissioner Carrie McDonagh, dated 1st June 2026

Appeal Reference:	2025/A0106 (Appeal B)
Appeal by:	Kelly Houses Ltd
Appeal against:	The refusal of full planning permission.
Proposed Development:	Erection of 12 no dwellings with associated road, open space, landscaping and site works.
Location:	Land to the rear (east) of 23 Mount Royal, Lisburn
Planning Authority:	Lisburn and Castlereagh City Council
Application Reference:	LA05/2023/0501/F
Procedure:	Written representations and Commissioner's site visit on 17th April 2026
Decision by:	Commissioner Carrie McDonagh, dated 1st June 2026

Decisions

1. The appeals are allowed and full planning permission is granted, subject to the conditions set out below.

Preliminary Matters

2. The appeals before the Commission are interrelated as they relate to adjoining land in the same ownership forming part of the same overall housing layout and have been refused for the same reasons. Accordingly, they were conjoined to be considered together and consequently there is a read-across in both appeal cases.

3. The Council's second refusal reason on both appeals relates to the failure to demonstrate exceptional circumstances to warrant the provision of the required 20% affordable housing off-site. However, the appellant is no longer proposing to provide alternative affordable housing elsewhere and therefore this aspect of the reason for refusal is no longer applicable. The matter of whether a proposed financial contribution is acceptable further to demonstration that the affordable housing requirement cannot be met remains to be considered.

4. Subsequent to the appellant's submission of the Integrated Renewable Energy Statement the Council withdrew their refusal reason relating to renewable energy generating facilities or technologies. Objectors did not raise matters relevant to energy hence no further consideration of this matter is necessary.

Reasons

5. The main issues for consideration in these appeals are whether the proposals are acceptable in the absence of an affordable housing component, whether the increased traffic prejudices the safety and convenience of road users and whether they cause harm to residential amenity.

Policy Context

6. Section 45(1) of the Planning Act (Northern Ireland) 2011 (the Act) indicates that in dealing with an application, regard must be had to the Local Development Plan (LDP), so far as material to the application, and to any other material considerations. Section 6(4) requires that regard must be had to the LDP unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

7. The Council adopted their Local Development Plan 2032 Plan Strategy (PS) in September 2023. The PS sets out the most up to date strategic policy framework for the Council area. In accordance with the transitional arrangements set out in the Schedule to the Planning (Local Development Plan) Regulations (Northern Ireland) 2015 (as amended), where the PS is adopted by the Council, a reference to the local development plan (LDP) is a reference to the Departmental Development Plan (DDP) and the PS read together. Any conflict between a policy contained in the DDP and those of the PS must be resolved in favour of the PS.

8. The Lisburn Area Plan 2001 (LAP) operates as the DDP for the area in which the appeal sites are located. The Belfast Metropolitan Area Plan (BMAP) was adopted in 2014 and subsequently declared unlawful in 2017. As such, the draft 2004 version (dBMAP) can be material in some circumstances. The appeal sites lie in the Lisburn Settlement Limit and are zoned as housing in both the LAP (LD3) and the dBMAP (LC 05/08). A third party refers to the Key Site Requirements (KSRs) which state "No vehicular access to Plantation Road due to difficulties at Plantation Road/Saintfield junction". I do not consider this equates to the proposals being contrary to the zoning because the Department conceded the need for the KSRs at the Public Local Inquiry into dBMAP on the basis that there was an extant permission for housing on the site. This approach is consistent with appeal 2013/A0183. No other provisions of the DDP have been raised in relation to these appeals.

9. Regional planning policy is set out in the Strategic Planning Policy Statement for Northern Ireland 'Planning for Sustainable Development – Edition 2' (SPPS). It is material to all decisions on individual appeals. It sets out the transitional arrangements which will operate until the local authority has adopted its PS. In accordance with the SPPS, as the Council has now adopted a PS, the previously retained policies cease to have effect within this council area. The appeals therefore fall to be considered against the provisions of the most up to date operational policies contained within the PS.

10. The PS Strategic Policies include SP 03 "Creating and Enhancing Shared Space and Quality Places" which supports proposals that contribute to the creation of an environment which is accessible to all and enhances opportunities for shared communities. Good quality housing that supports more balanced communities must offer a variety of house types, sizes and tenures to meet different needs. SP 08 "Housing in Settlements" criterion c) also promotes balanced local communities through a mixture of house types of different size and tenure, including affordable and specialised housing. Policy HOU 10 "Affordable Housing in Settlements" requires 20% provision on sites of 5 dwellings or more to deliver balanced communities. Policy TRA 2 "Access to Public Roads" prevents proposals that prejudice road safety or significantly inconvenience the flow of vehicles or which would conflict with Policy TRA 3 "Access to Protected Routes". Policy TRA 8 "Active Travel Networks and Infrastructure Provision" requires safe and convenient access through provision of walking and cycling infrastructure, both within the development and linking to planned or existing networks.

The Appeal Sites

11. Appeal Site A relates to a proposed Phase 2 of the Ballymullan Manor development which leads from the Plantation Road/Plantation Mews junction. At 1.35 hectares, Site A is accessed from the south via an existing internal road terminating at 12 Ballymullan Manor. Temporary fencing seals the end of the turning head adjacent to an area of grassed open space. The land falls towards a cleared area in the south-western area to the rear of adjacent terrace dwellings at Plantation Mews. It contains a large shed. A number of storage containers and construction equipment and materials, including scaffolding and fencing have been stored on this area. Appeal Site B (Phase 3) is located to the rear/north of and accessed through Site A. It is 1.46 hectares. There is no physical demarcation between the two appeal sites.

12. Both sites have areas where the grass is scrapped back, with mounds of construction material and a construction access track running northward in Site A. The land falls from the southeast and east to the north, west and northwest. The western boundary of the combined sites abuts the rear of housing at Mount Royal and is defined by fencing with vegetation interspersed. The southwestern boundary with Plantation Mews is defined by existing vegetation and close boarded timber fencing. Part of eastern boundary of Appeal Site A is defined by an existing retaining wall, a close boarded timber fence and an existing hedgerow and dispersed trees. The northern boundary between Appeal Site B and the remainder of the housing zoning is undefined on the ground. The area is characterised by residential development. Agricultural land is to the east, beyond the settlement development limit.

The Planning History of the Wider Zoning

13. The area has an extensive planning history for housing development. This includes a 2012 PAC decision 2011/A0263 (planning ref: S/2011/0383/F) which permits an amended layout and change of house types for a housing development comprising of 439 residential units, which includes the appeal sites. Access to this development was approved from Hillhall Road. A Certificate of Lawful Development, ref: LA05/2022/0246/LDP confirms the commencement of a development for 96 dwellings to the north of the appeal sites for another developer. The Commission decision 2011/A0263 is hereafter described as the extant permission. It contains no requirement to deliver affordable housing.

14. A Certificate of Lawful Proposed Use or Development (CLOPUD) which relates to a plot within Appeal Site B confirms that: "*The Council, having considered the information provided is satisfied that sufficient evidence had been submitted to show that the operations specified in the First Schedule constitute the lawful commencement of development within the required timescales as per condition 10 of planning approval S/2011/0383/F (2011/A0263). Therefore, it would be lawful to continue with the works associated with the proposed development*." (LA05/2024/0236/CLOPUD).

15. The extant permission includes a now completed roundabout from Hillhall Road and requires the construction of a spine road along its full length. This northern section is now in use to provide access to occupied dwellings and for ongoing construction. However, this completed section is within the ownership of another developer. A further portion to provide access to the southerly appeal sites needs to be completed by the developer of the lands to the north of Appeal Site B. The appellant nevertheless has a lawful entitlement to build out the remainder of the extant planning approval.

The Appeal Proposals

16. The appellant acknowledges that it may take some time for the other developer to deliver the missing section of the spine road. He therefore proposes to change the appeal sites access location to run from the recent development, namely Ballymullan Manor, via Plantation Mews/Road, rather than from Hillhall Road. Ballymullan Manor is located at the southern extreme of the zoning. The Department for Infrastructure (DFI) have advised that the alternative access can only accommodate 25 units. The appellant therefore seeks to reduce the number of units from the 67 previously approved on the combined appeal sites.

17. Appeal A comprises of 13 units with associated road, open space, landscaping. It also includes an amended site layout to the front of the occupied dwelling at No. 12 Ballymullan Manor. A change of house type was approved recently for this property under planning ref: LA05/2022/1001/F. The layout of No. 12 raises no issues material to this appeal. Appeal B comprises of 12 units accessed through Site A, including Site 30, the detail of which is the focus of concern of a representation passed to the Commission as part of the background papers. Combined the appeals propose 25 new units in a mix of detached two and three storey dwellings, including 3, 4 and 6 bedroom units.

18. Planting is to be retained along site boundaries and new public open space is provided in two separate areas within Site A along with additional planting throughout. Private amenity space in Appeal A ranges from 100m² on to 712m², whereas in Appeal B it ranges from 252m² to 1381m².

Consideration of Policy Context

19. In addition to the strategic policies previously listed requiring delivery of a balanced community that offers a variety of house type, sizes and tenures, Policy HOU 10 refers to situations where there is need for affordable housing identified in the Northern Ireland Housing Executive (NIHE) Housing Need Assessment. Whilst a copy was not provided, the appellant nevertheless did not dispute that there is a supported need for five affordable housing units comprising a mix of 2 and 3 bedroom family homes. Neither the affordable housing nor size/bedroom mix has been provided in line with the objective to create mixed and balanced communities as set out in refusal reason 1. The relevant part of Policy HOU 10 is repeated below:

"*Where the need for affordable housing is identified, through the Housing Need Assessment[1], on sites of more than 0.5 hectares or comprising of 5 residential units or more, proposals will only be permitted where provision is made for a minimum of 20% of all units to be affordable. This provision will be secured and agreed through a Section 76 Planning Agreement.*

All developments incorporating affordable housing should be designed to integrate with the overall scheme with no significant distinguishable design differences, in accordance with any other relevant policies contained within the plan strategy.

In exceptional circumstances where it is demonstrated that the affordable housing requirement cannot be met, alternative provision must be made by the applicant, or an appropriate financial contribution in lieu must be agreed through a Section 76 Planning Agreement. Such agreements must contribute to the objective of creating mixed and balanced communities."

20. The appellant's argument is that it is unreasonable to require any affordable housing because their secured extant permission does not require it and can be delivered via either of their two fallback positions, namely, for them to build out the extant permission in time or alternatively to sell to the adjacent developer to complete the development. In their view Policy HOU 10 does not define, or constrain what constitutes adequate demonstration that the affordable housing requirement cannot be met and either fallback option would meet the exceptional circumstances test, which then allows an appropriate financial contribution in lieu of on-site affordable housing. They further argue that having considered the balance of costs, the provision of affordable housing is not a commercially realistic option and therefore, if necessary, they would pursue their more profitable fallback options where no affordable housing is required.

21. I disagree with the appellant that it is unreasonable to require any affordable housing as part of the appeal proposals on the basis that the extant permission does not require it. The appeal developments are new stand-alone proposals,

[1] Supplied by the Northern Ireland Housing Executive as the statutory housing authority

with an amended access to be determined in the first instance under the prevailing policy context, which in this case is different to the policy context under which the extant permission was decided. That planning history, including the argument that its delivery without affordable housing constitutes a fallback position (which I will return to later) are relevant material considerations to be weighed against policy compliance as part of the overall assessment when reaching a balanced judgement.

22. To set aside the policy requirement for 20% of all units to be affordable, paragraph 3 requires that exceptional circumstances are demonstrated as to why the affordable housing requirement cannot be met. If this exceptional test is met the policy requires alternative provision or an appropriate financial contribution.

23. As part of the planning application the argument was advanced that the delivery of affordable housing was unviable and five alternative co-ownership houses were proposed 2.4 miles away at their Fairfield/Mayfield Development. This offer, which has now been withdrawn, was rejected by the Council on the basis that it amounted to segregation by location, which runs contrary to the objective of creating mixed and balanced communities. They advanced definitions of 'exceptional' which included unusual; not what happens regularly or expected; and situations or incidents that are only likely to happen very infrequently to demonstrate that the circumstances of the proposal are not exceptional to warrant a departure from the requirement to deliver on site affordable housing. As alternative provision no longer forms part of the proposals, and the Mayfield development is a standalone development neither it, any financial benefits from its general market disposal nor the policy provisions related to alternative provision are discussed further. In lieu of on-site provision the appellant's final position is, on a without prejudice basis, the offer of a financial contribution. I will return to this aspect of the proposals later in these decisions.

24. In respect of the first policy hurdle, namely the demonstration that the affordable housing requirement cannot be met, to my mind, a combination of financial/commercial, contractual and legal realities, supported by evidence could demonstrate such an exceptional circumstance. If financial/commercial information forms part of an appellant's case, in the absence of definitive guidance in the PS or supplementary information from the Council, its format is at the discretion of the appellant. Accordingly, the Council's references to the absence of a viability assessment or information authored by a suitably qualified independent person are misplaced. However, the obligation remains on the appellant to meaningfully demonstrate why the affordable housing requirement cannot be met before seeking to avail of either of the two available routes for compliance with Policy HOU 10.

25. The appellant argued that the provision of 20% or 5 units for affordable housing is not a commercially realistic option and therefore the requirement cannot be met. While not repeated here due to its commercial nature their cost estimates are based on the replacement of 5 large, detached units of c2300sqft with 5 social/affordable units of c1100sqft, amounting to a saleable loss of 6000sq ft (5 x 1200sqft). Loss of sales revenue based on sales price per sqft is provided, along with the reduced build costs as a result of constructing the smaller social affordable units.

26. The estimated net loss in revenue that would be incurred by the appellant if the 20% affordable housing requirement were provided is £895K. This does not however equate to the appeal development being built at a loss, as noted by the Council at rebuttal stage. Rather, the appellant refers to the proposals delivering a significantly less profitable development.

27. Whilst £895k is a significant amount, and there are various methodologies for calculating costs, I have no acquisition costs such as land purchase or detail of finance/professional costs to understand the outlay to date as part of the cost recovery from the expected sales income. It is unclear if the appellant contributed to the £400,000 payment by JJJ towards the road works and I cannot make a robust comparison of % profit with or without the affordable housing provision to assist in understanding the relationship between residual and benchmark land value. I also have no context against reasonable general market profit expectations for a site of the combined scale proposed in this area. Intermediate housing for sale is not the only affordable housing solution and there are inconsistencies between the calculations and the unit types proposed, including the unit size on which the affordable rebuild cost is based (1100sqft/102m²) compared to the smallest proposed 3 bed unit of 1688sqft/157m². The calculations provided indicate a lower sales return from the appeal proposals if the affordable housing requirement were included. It does not demonstrate those sales returns would have dropped to the extent that the proposals cannot deliver five affordable housing units. Combined with the number of variables involved in the cost calculations and the difficulty in establishing their context within overall profitability, I am not persuaded the financial evidence demonstrates that the 20% affordable housing requirement cannot be met.

28. The test of “cannot be met” differs to the appellant’s argument that there is no commercial reality of them delivering affordable housing as they would choose not to proceed with the proposals due to their alternative fallback. I do not agree that Policy HOU 10 should be interpreted to qualify such a scenario as an exceptional circumstance. Assisted by the dictionary definitions previously provided, a fallback argument is neither unusual nor infrequent. Such arguments often arise either due to a historic use, permitted development or planning permissions/history. I cannot accept they constitute an exceptional circumstance to demonstrate that the policy requirement for affordable housing cannot be met. But rather, fallback arguments are site specific and fact sensitive matters to be weighed as a material consideration, the effects of which will need to be taken account of and weighted appropriately in the planning balance.

29. The appellant also provided a head for terms for a sum of £125,000 as an appropriate financial contribution in lieu of affordable housing, payable in five instalments on the sale of every 5th property to be delivered through a Section 76 Agreement. They state any higher contribution would result in them resorting to the fallback mentioned previously. This was rejected by the Council on the basis that there was no explanation of who the contribution would go to and they could not receive it as they are not a social housing provider.

30. The absence of any framework to allocate and agree financial contributions is not critical to this case as the appellant has not met the first policy hurdle within Policy HOU 10, in that they have not demonstrated exceptional circumstances for why they cannot meet the affordable housing requirement.

The Fallback Argument

31. The appellant contends that as there is no impediment to the spine road being delivered other than short term timing in so far as if these appeals are dismissed, substantial weight should be attributed to the likelihood of the 67 dwellings being built out as per the extant approval. They further advance a second argument that they could accept an offer to sell both appeal sites to the adjacent landowner who could complete the approved dwellings as an extension of their portion of the extant permission. The Council dismiss this second option as speculation. They further dispute the delivery of the extant permission is a realistic prospect as there is no greater prospect of the access from Hillhall Road being extended to allow the fallback to be progressed.

32. The appellant argues both fallback options are much more than the "very slight indeed" minimum established in *Mansell V Tonbridge and Malling Borough Council (2017) EWCA Civ 1314* which states that it is enough that there is a real prospect, that is, a genuine possibility of the fallback development taking place. A probability or likelihood of that occurring is not required, and indeed fallback should be taken into account even if the prospect of it occurring is "very slight indeed-a possibility will suffice". This is consistent with the judgement in *Samual Smith Old Brewery (Tadcaster) V SOSCLG (2009) EWCA Civ 333* Pg 21.

33. The consideration of whether there is a material fall-back engages a number of elements, that is, there must be a lawful ability to undertake such an operation, there must be a likelihood or real prospect of such operation being taken up, and if those elements are attributable to the case, a comparison must then be made between the proposed development and the fallback position to determine if the former would have less or no more detrimental effect.

34. Whilst the purpose of the CLOPD submission was to resolve related drainage/culverting matters, the lawfulness of the future completion of one of the dwellings has been certified as lawful since September 2024. Consistent with this confirmation, there has been a material commencement for the 67 units approved on the appeal sites. The first element is satisfied.

35. In respect of the second element, as to whether there is a realistic prospect of the extant permission occurring, I consider the Council's argument to be somewhat contradictory. On one hand they argue that there is no clear prospect of the approved layout being implemented in full as it is nearly 14 years since its grant. Their reasoning, provided in line with *Coln Park LLP v Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government (2011) EWHC 2282 (admin*) is the absence of a programme of works indicating a timescale to progress the road or evidence from the adjacent landowner of his intentions to purchase the appeal sites. Then after questioning the lengthy progression timeframe, they go on to argue the appellant has not:

    - Demonstrated their fallback position will be for privately owned dwellings only, citing a nearby housing development at Plantation View which was initially approved as a private development and later developed by a housing association (planning ref: LA05/2025/0466/F). This nearby development pre-dates the PS policy and is an example of how a housing association can

subsequently become involved in housing schemes suitable for social tenure initially based only on the private market.

- Attempted altered site layouts with a more diverse mix of house types, such as apartments or
- Considered the feasibility of retaining part of their combined sites, including whether a portion could be held over for future development in line with the extant permission via the Spine Road, enabling the incorporation of a wider/smaller unit mix in a denser layout for the remaining part of 25 units, consistent with the capacity accepted by DFI.

36. The Council therefore appear to be adopting an inconsistent approach, on the one hand arguing that an absence of evidence that the extant permission will be completed undermines the fallback position, whilst simultaneously arguing that it could be completed by a social housing provider or in different configurations, which are also reliant on the delivery of the road as part of the extant permission.

37. Fallback arguments are site and case specific and my consideration of whether there is a real prospect of delivery without a requirement for affordable housing is considered on the evidential context as related to the facts of this case. Whilst no definitive timescale for the road's completion is provided by the appellant, I do not agree with the Council that there is no real prospect of delivery in full for the following reasons:

38. Firstly, the significant scale of the committed housing zoning and the extant permission. The zoning has been identified as a Housing Committed Site in the latest 2014 iteration of BMAP (LC 03/20) indicating it had started by that time and the PS, with an end date not until 2032, as detailed at page 12 retains the DDP zoning. 439 units were authorised and notwithstanding the passage of time since its grant, or an amendment permission two years later (2012/A0263 of 17th September 2014), the Council have not detailed how many units have been completed thus far via Ballymullan Manor to the south and Ballantine Garden Village in the northern Hillhall Road Section or why that pace of progression raises concern that it has stalled or will not be completed. They also do not detail if the ongoing use of the spine road as far south as the rear of Nos 1 and 2 Ballantine Walk, with a separate junction adjacent to 10 Ballantine Lane indicates it will not be completed nor is there any suggestion of any other physical impediment to the works continuing. There is a clear gap between the ongoing construction works to the north of the zoning and the appeal sites however, I would expect it would take time to build-out a zoning of this scale. My observations indicate construction works are ongoing, with significant progress having been made towards delivery and I do not consider the time since approval is indicative that the permission will not be completed.

39. Secondly, no evidence has been advanced to make me question the future co-operation between the landowners such as a deterioration in their commercial or contractual relationship. Furthermore, the appellant has retained ownership of land north of Appeal Site B (Phase 3) that is required by the adjacent landowner to complete their approved houses reducing any risk to delivery. The blue land in the location plan identifies additional land beyond, including an area in the northeast. An overlay plan of the appellant's folio on the approved layout highlights areas of overlap required for the completion of the adjacent approved

plots, consistent with the appellant's position that the case specifics require that the two developers must work together to deliver the site.

40. Thirdly, the immediate commencement of the proposals are no longer critical to the appellant's business operations. The appellant has provided details of their restructured business over the short term given the fall from an average annual output of circa 20 units to 8 in 2024 and just 1 in 2025 due to a shortage of land and alleged planning delay on the appeal sites. Whilst sub contractor capacity was reduced, key employees had moved onto other small sites now completed. They state they have secured and will relocate to either a site in Ballygowan, which is pending imminent approval or a second site in Lisburn, the purchase of which is scheduled for completion in March 2026. Combined they provide development land for 37 units, enabling the appellant company time to develop sites elsewhere while they wait for the southward progression of the spine road.

41. Fourthly, the appellant's cited intentions to complete the development is substantiated through their engagement with the CLOPUD process, the scrapping back of some vegetation, the retention of equipment/construction materials on the site compound within Appeal Site A, and the development of a construction track to the north. In my judgement, they have shown some willingness to complete the extant development should the appeal proposals not be approved.

42. Furthermore, notwithstanding, the Council's argument that the appellant's purported option to sell to the adjacent owner is unsubstantiated, they argue that the smaller unit sizes proposed in the extant permission, including terrace units and apartments make it more likely to fall within the scope of a developement by an affordable housing provider. Without any indication of a lack of demand for private housing or other reasoning why it is not suitable for private housing, the fact an acquisition by an affordable/socal provider has happened elsewhere (Plantation View) cannot be considered a viable challenge to the assumption that the extant permission will not deliver affordable housing. The previous sales negotiations referred to and knowledge of the wider site by the adjacent landowner reinforce my conclusions that there is nothing preventing the extant permission being completed by the appellant, the adjacent landowner or another developer.

43. For the reasons set out above, I accept that whilst the appellant would prefer to develop the sites as per the layouts proposed in these appeals rather than wait on the development of the road, in the event they are dismissed, there is a realistic prospect that they would instead pursue the fallback option of constructing both appeal sites in line with the extant permission without any affordable housing component. In my judgement this should be given significant weight in the balancing exercise.

44. Finally, a comparison must be made between the proposed development and the fall-back position in terms of their respective impacts on the environment. The question to be answered is whether the proposed development has implications on the environment worse than or broadly similar to the extant permission?

45. The fact there is an extant planning permission provides a benchmark to allow for a direct comparison between the two schemes. No party has advanced the

argument that the impact of the extant permission in terms of density, layout and road design and overall nature of the development does not remain acceptable. Given that the proposed development is of a lower density, its overall impact on the environment will be reduced in terms of overall build-up in the area, increased landscaped garden areas and less sewerage capacity required. Overall, the environmental impact between the two schemes would be broadly similar. Both schemes have an acceptable overall housing layout and neither propose to deliver affordable housing. In environmental terms the appeal proposals have no more impact than the fallback position.

46. Whilst the proposals may allow the appellant to close out their interest in the appeal sites sooner than the fallback position allows, being located at the southern section of the remaining lands, I have no evidence that this is of any consequence for the delivery of the remainder of the zoning to the north, which can still be accessed via Hillhall Road. It does not alter my conclusion that significant weight should be attributed to the fallback position in the particular circumstances of this case. The real prospect that the extant permission could occur without affordable housing delivery is a determining material consideration that outweighs the conflict with Policy HOU 10. The Council's refusal reasons are not sustained.

Road Safety

47. Matters raised in third party representations in respect of the planning application relating to Appeal B/Phase 3 and in a third-party objection encompass matters related to the road network capacity as a consequence of the relocation from access/egress from Hillhall Road. It is argued that there would be further congestion to an already busy local road network in particular, the vicinity of Saintfield Road roundabout, considered a dangerous junction with a history of numerous collisions. Alongside other recent development including Mount Royal, Plantation View (referred to previously) it is argued that 60+ additional vehicles (2.4 cars per dwelling) plus visitors and deliveries to the proposed dwellings will exacerbate the congestion and prejudice road safety. The Council consider the general access arrangements are acceptable based on the advice of DFI Roads.

48. The fact that previous permissions for housing on this site and the wider housing zoning were to be served via Hillhall Road does not weigh against these proposals. They must be assessed on their own merits.

49. Policy TRA 2 "Access to Public Roads" permits proposals involving direct access or the intensification of use of an existing access onto a public road where (a) it will not prejudice road safety or significantly inconvenience the flow of vehicles and (b) it will not conflict within Policy TRA 3 "Access to Protected Routes". Consideration will be given to the nature and scale of the development, character of existing development, the contribution to creation of a quality environment, the location and number of existing accesses and the standard of the existing road network together with the speed and volume of traffic using the adjacent public road and any expected increase.

50. Plantation Road serves a large number of dwellings and its junction with Saintfield Road is located circa. 600m to the northwest of the proposed access. The appellant's Traffic Assessment Form (TAF) estimates the proposals would

generate 4 arrivals and 9 departures (total of 13) in the AM peak hour (08:00-09:00) and 8 arrivals and 4 departures (total of 12) in the PM peak hour (17:00-18:00). This demonstrates that the proposal would result in 4.7% increase in traffic flow using Plantation Road, and less than 0.5% on Saintfield Road. These increases in traffic flow are under the 5% definition of intensification as set out in Development Control Advice Note 15 – Vehicle Access Standards. DFI have confirmed that the changes in traffic flows as a result of the proposals are within daily traffic variations at this junction.

51. My site visit occurred during the school run collection periods. I noted traffic build up on the Saintfield Road, leading to longer waiting times to exit from Plantation Road in the direction of the M1 motorway's signal-controlled roundabout. However, an appellant is not required to improve existing issues with the road network. Policy only requires that road safety is not prejudiced and that the flow of vehicles is not significantly inconvenienced. I am mindful of the appellant's reference to implemented road safety enhancements as part of the Plantation View approval, which included improvements to turn radii and increased visibility splays for traffic emerging from Plantation Road and revisions to the highway alignment for traffic coming off the Saintfield Road Roundabout travelling towards Plantation Road, which were considered to slow traffic speeds. My observations were consistent with this, and traffic is already slow moving in the general vicinity due to the volume of traffic and wait times at the lights. I do not consider the increase would be of such a level that it would significantly inconvenience the flow of traffic on the wider road network, even during peak periods.

52. In terms of whether the Plantation/Saintfield Rd junctions are hazardous, the appellant's technical note includes available accident data obtained from PSNI over a 5-year period between 1st January 2020 and 31st December 2025. It indicates one road traffic accident at the Plantation Road junction onto Saintfield Road and two on Saintfield Road between its junction with Plantation Road and Saintfield Road/M1 Roundabout. Combined with the safety benefit from the road works referred to above, this low number of recorded accidents does not support the argument that the vicinity of Saintfield Road roundabout is a dangerous junction with a history of numerous collisions.

53. Third parties describe Plantation Road as a narrow residential road with on street parking and not suitable for heavy volumes of traffic, including current concerns related to the deterioration of the condition of the road surface and capacity for carrying up to 1400 loads of infill material required for site preparation works.

54. Plantation Road is generally 5.5m in width over its' length with some localised widening at junctions. The DFI/ Planning guidance document 'Creating Places – Achieving Quality in Residential Developments' advises that a road of 5.5m width can accommodate residential development of up to 400 units. Plantation Road is therefore within these development limits. My observations confirm the road is suitable for the current volume of vehicles. I was able to travel throughout the local streets unimpeded by parked cars and noted residents walking safely along pavements.

55. The appellant refers to the IEMA Environmental Assessment of Traffic and Movement (2023) guidance on how the environmental impacts associated with traffic movements should be assessed. It advises that changes in traffic flows of

less than 10% are generally accepted as having no discernible environmental effect, as daily variance in traffic flows can be of similar magnitude. At 5% I do not consider this to be significant. I do not consider the traffic generated from an additional 25 dwellings using this road or Ballymullan and Clogher roads would be detrimental to either walking or cycling/leisure pursuits given the space available. The proposals do not offend Policy TRA 8 "Active Travel Networks and Infrastructure Provision" as the proposals provide for safe and convenient access through provision of walking and cycling infrastructure linking to planned or existing networks.

56. Whilst the transportation of building materials during the construction period will undoubtedly detract from residents' amenity due to traffic, noise and general disturbance, the likely duration of that phase is time limited. I am not persuaded this disturbance will be so significant as to result in unacceptable damage to the area's environmental quality. Furthermore, I do not consider the proposed developments would have any greater impact in respect of these matters than that of the fallback position embodied in my previous consideration. Pollution has already been attributed to traffic from Hillhall Road and whilst its displacement and road noise may be material from an environmental perspective, I do not consider it to be detrimental to the health and wellbeing of existing residents. Policy TRA 2 is not offended.

Other Matters

57. Concerns raised in a representation in respect of the boundary treatment proposals at Site 30 and the privacy of existing residents at Mount Royal refer to the area behind the proposed garage having a level difference over a 4m distance resulting in a need for retaining walls or 45-degree embankment. The Section drawing shows Site 30's relationship with Mount Royal at the transect 01E (Section E-E). The proposed dwelling has a finished floor level almost 2 metres higher with a max. 1 in 3 planted rear garden slope. It sits at an oblique angle with any potential for overlooking mitigated by the existing boundary vegetation and the separation distances between neighbouring properties well in excess of the Creating Places standards limiting any negative impact on residential amenity or overlooking of adjacent properties. Trees and vegetation along the site boundaries are stated on the plans as to be retained. Protective fencing around the trees during construction is also highlighted on the layout plans. This can be reinforced through an appropriately worded condition, including provision for replacement planting, if required. No persusave evidence is provided that there are bats present in the boundary trees and in any event, the provisions of natural heritage legislation still applies.

58. In respect of drainage concerns connected to the gradient of the sewerage infrastructure wayleaves and potential displacement of surface flood waters, Section E-E shows an earth bund proposed to the western boundary of Plot 30 to deflect any overland flow from entering the adjacent garden, with a flat area before the proposed rear garden levels rise towards the proposed dwelling. NI Water and NIEA Water Management Unit, the statutory authorities with responsibility for these matters have not raised objection. A condition requiring submission of a final drainage assessment, including detail of the Article 161 Agreement prior to construction will provide surety for the safe management of any out of sewer flooding emanating from the surface water drainage network.

59. For the reasons set out above, I have not been persuaded that the matters raised in respresentations or by the third party to these appeals would warrant the withholding of planning permission.

Conditions

60. The proposed access is an extension from a turning end which has already been constructed. A condition requiring the construction and maintenance of visibility splays, forward sight distance and integral car parking spaces in perpetuity should be attached to the grant of planning permission. The proposals are the subject of a Private Streets (Northern Ireland) Order 1980 determination. Verges/strips along a shared surface roads should be protected from any development such as buildings walls or fences, hedges or trees by way of conditions. The drainage assessment previously submitted shall be updated and agreed with the Council to demonstrate the safe management of sewer flooding prior to the construction of the drainage network. Identified areas of open space should not be used for any other purpose other than play space/open space. Existing vegetation along boundaries should be protected during construction and retained and the implementation of the detailed landscape proposals, including hard and soft landscaping should be secured by a condition. In addition, a condition requiring compliance with the open space management plan is necessary.

61. As I have found that the fallback position determining, the Councils suggested condition requesting the provision of a Section 76 Planning Agreement for affordable housing delivery is not necessary.

Conditions Appeal Site A (2025/A0105 & LA05/2022/0842/F)

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

2. The vehicular accesses, including visibility splays and any forward sight distance shall be provided in accordance with drawing no. 29B dated 26th April 2024, prior to the occupation of any other works or 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 250 mm above the level of the adjoining carriageway and such splays shall be retained and kept clear thereafter.

3. The access gradients shall not exceed 8% (1 in 12.5) over the first 5m outside the road boundary. Where the vehicular access crosses footway or verge, 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.

4. The Private Streets (Northern Ireland) Order 1980 as amended by the Private Streets (Amendment) (Northern Ireland) Order 1992. The width, position and arrangement of the streets, and the land to be regarded as being comprised in the streets, shall be as indicated on drawing no. 29B dated 26th April 2024.

5. No dwellings shall be occupied until hard surfaced areas have been constructed in accordance with approved drawing no. 29B dated 24th April 2024 and Car Parking Schedule Phase 2 drawing no. 4D dated 16th February 2024, to provide adequate facilities for parking 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.

6. Any existing street furniture or landscaping obscuring or located within the proposed carriageway, sight visibility splays, forward sight lines or access shall, after obtaining permission from the appropriate authority, be removed, relocated or adjusted at the applicant's expense.

7. No dwelling shall be occupied until that part of the service road, which provides access to it has been constructed to base course; the final wearing course shall be applied on the completion of each phase.

8. Prior to construction of the drainage network, the Developer shall submit a final drainage assessment for approval in writing to the planning authority, including details of any Article 161 Agreements with NI Water. This must demonstrate the safe management of any out of sewer flooding emanating from the surface water drainage network, agreed under Article 161 in a 1 in 100-year event, including an allowance for climate change (10%) and urban creep (10%).

9. Prior to occupation of any dwelling unit, the Developer shall submit to the planning authority and agree in writing details of the proposed Open Space Provider (not being a Private Management Company) and the Open Space Agreement shall be entered into by the Developer and Open Space Provider for the development to manage the open space to be constructed as part of the development. The open space shall be managed and maintained in perpetuity by the Open Space provider.

10. The boundary treatments to each dwelling unit shall be completed in accordance with drawing no 5C Boundary Details Schedule and 30A Landscaping Plan Phase 2 dated prior to the occupation of each individual unit hereby approved.

11 The open space and communal areas and aII hard and soft landscape works shall be carried out in accordance with drawing no.03D Site Layout, no. 30A Landscape Plan Phase 2 dated 16th February 2024 and no. 6C Proposed Open Space Phase 2 and 3 dated 23rd November 2023 and the approved details. The works shall be carried out no later than the first available planting season after occupation of that phase of the development and maintained and managed thereafter, in accordance with the approved Plan by a suitably constituted management company.

12. If within a period of 5 years 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.

13. All existing trees, shrubs and hedges on the site boundaries as shown on drawing no. 30A Landscape Phase 2 dated 16th February 2024 shall be permanently retained unless otherwise agreed in writing with the planning authority.

14. Prior to commencement of the development all existing trees to be retained shall be protected by appropriate fencing in accordance with British Standard 5837:2012 – Trees in Relation to Design, Demolition and Construction and shall be maintained until all equipment, machinery and surplus materials have been removed from the site. Nothing shall be stored or placed in any area fenced in accordance with this condition and the ground levels within these areas shall not be altered, nor any excavation be made or any other works carried out, or fires lit within the prior written consent of the planning authority.

15. If any retained tree is removed, uprooted or destroyed or dies within five years from the date of completion of the development it shall be replaced within the next planting season by a tree or trees in the same location of a species and size to be agreed in writing with the planning authority.

The decision 2025/A0105 Appeal Site A - 12 Ballymullan Manor and Land north of 5-13 Plantation Mews and East of 24-59 Mount Royal, Lisburn is based on the following drawings: -

Drg. No.	LA05/2022/0842/F Drawing Title	Scale	Date Received	Architect Dwg No.
01A	Site Location Plan	1:1250 @A2	25.5.23	2602- 050-01-06-001
03D	Proposed Site Plan- Phase 2	1:500 @ A2	16.2.24	2602-050-04-04-002-013
04D	Car Parking Schedule – Phase 2	1:500 @A2	16.2.24	2602-050-04-04-002-014
05C	Boundary details Schedule	1:500 @ A2	16.2.24	2602-050-04-04-002-007
06C	Proposed open space Phase 2 & 3	1:500 @A1	23.11.23	2602-04-04-02-002-03-021
07D	Proposed Site Sections A-D Phase 3	1:200 @A0	23.11.23	2602-050-04-04-02-002-020
08B	Boundary Details	1:50	18.9.23	2602-010-12 – BD-001 (D)
09C	HT A- Gatelodge – Site 17 & 39 sketch Plans 2077 sqft	1:100	16.2.24	2602-010-15 -HT A- 001 (Rev B)
10C	HT A- Gatelodge – Site 17 & 39 sketch	1:100	16.2.24	2602-010-15-HT A-002 (Rev B)

	Elevations			
11C	HT A – Garage Sketch Plan & Elevations	1:100	16.2.24	2602-010-15-HT A-003 (Rev B)
12C	HT C – site 32-35 & 37-38 Sketch Plans 2833 sqft	1:100	16.2.24	2602-010-15-HT C-001 (Rev B)
13C	HT C – site 32-35 & 37-38 Sketch Elevations	1:100	16.2.24	2602-010-15-HT C-002 (Rev B)
14C	HT C – Garage Plans & Elevations Site 32-35 & 37-38 Sketch Elevations	1:100	7.2.24	2602-010-15-HT C-003 (Rev B)
15C	HT D- Site 14 & 15 Sketch Plans 1688 sqft	1:100	7.2.24	2602-010-15-HT D-001 (Rev B)
16C	HT D -Site 14 & 15 Sketch Elevations	1:100	16.2.24	2602-010-15-HT D-002 (Rev B)
17C	HT D- Garage Sketch Plan & Elevations site 14 & 15	1:100	16.2.24	2602-010-15-HT D-003 (Rev B)
18C	HT D (h) - Site 36 Sketch Plans (h) 1688sqft	1:100	16.2.24	2602-010-15-HT D (h) - 004 (Rev B)
19C	HT D (h) - Site 36 Sketch Elevations	1:100	16.2.24	2602-010-15-HT D (h) - 005 (Rev B)
20C	HT D (h) – Garage Sketch Plan and Elevations - Site 36	1:100	16.2.24	2602-010-15-HT D (h) - 006 (Rev B)
21C	HT E (h) - Site 18 Sketch Plans 2556sqft	1:100	16.2.24	2602-010-15-HT E (h) - 001 (Rev B)
22C	HT E (h) - Site 18 Sketch Elevations	1:100	16.2.24	2602-010-15-HT E (h) - 002 (Rev B)
23C	HT E (h) – Garage Sketch Plans & Elevations, Site 18	1:100	16.2.24	2602-010-15-HT E (h) - 003 (Rev B)
24C	HT E (SL) - Site 16 Sketch Plans 2556sqft	1:100	16.2.24	2602-010-15-HT E (SL) - 004 (Rev B)
25C	HT E (SL) - Site 16 Sketch Elevations	1:100	16.2.24	2602-010-15-HT E (SL) - 005 (Rev B)

26C	HT E (SL) – Garage Sketch Plans & Elevations, Site 16	1:100	16.2.24	2602-010-15-HT E (h) - 006 (Rev B)
28B	Phase 2 Road sections	1:500 @A1	16.2.24	WSC Consulting - 16-1375-1221 A
29B	Phase 2 Road Plan, Section & PSD Colouring	1:250 @ A1	26.4.24	WSC Consulting - 16-1375-1220 Rev C
30A	Landscaping Plan Phase 2	1:500 @ A2	16.02.24	2602-050-04-04-04-002-023 Rev D
35	Phase 2/3 Proposed Drainage Plan	1:500 @ A1	16.01.25	WSC Consulting – 16-1375-1261
36	Phase 2/3 Proposed Drainage Storm Sections 1/1	1:500 @ A1	16 Jan 25	WSC Consulting – 16-1375-1262

Conditions - Appeal Site B (2025/A0106 & LA05/2023/0501/F)

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

2. The vehicular accesses, including visibility splays and any forward sight distance shall be provided in accordance with drawing no. 27E Phase 3 Road Plan, Section and PSD Colouring dated 26th April 2024, prior to the occupation of any other works or 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 250 mm above the level of the adjoining carriageway and such splays shall be retained and kept clear thereafter.

3. The access gradients shall not exceed 8% (1 in 12.5) over the first 5m outside the road boundary. Where the vehicular access crosses footway or verge, 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.

4. The Private Streets (Northern Ireland) Order 1980 as amended by the Private Streets (Amendment) (Northern Ireland) Order 1992. The width, position and arrangement of the streets, and the land to be regarded as being comprised in the streets, shall be as indicated on drawing no. 27E Phase 3 Road Plan, Section and PSD Colouring dated 26th April 2024.

5. No dwellings shall be occupied until hard surfaced areas have been constructed in accordance with approved drawing no. 27E Phase 3 Road Plan, Section and PSD Colouring dated 26th April 2024 and drawing no. 26 D Car Parking Schedule Phase 3 dated 19th February 2024, to provide adequate facilities for parking 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.

6. Any existing street furniture or landscaping obscuring or located within the proposed carriageway, sight visibility splays, forward sight lines or access shall, after obtaining permission from the appropriate authority, be removed, relocated or adjusted at the developer's expense.

7. No dwelling shall be occupied until that part of the service road, which provides access to it has been constructed to base course; the final wearing course shall be applied on the completion of each phase.

8. Prior to construction of the drainage network, the Developer shall submit a final drainage assessment for approval in writing to the planning authority, including details of any Article 161 Agreements with NI Water. This must demonstrate the safe management of any out of sewer flooding emanating from the surface water drainage network, agreed under Article 161 in a 1 in 100-year event, including an allowance for climate change (10%) and urban creep (10%).

9. The boundary treatments to each dwelling unit shall be completed in accordance with drawing 24 Boundary Details Phase 3 dated 9th June 2023, drawing no 25D Boundary Treatment Phase 3 dated 19th February 2024 and drawing no.28B Landscaping Plan Phase 3 dated 19th February 2024 prior to the occupation of each individual unit hereby approved.

10. All hard and soft landscape works shall be carried out in accordance with drawing no. 02D Proposed Site Plan dated 19th February 2024 and no. 28B Landscaping Plan Phase 3 dated 19th February 2024. The works shall be carried out no later than the first available planting season after occupation of that phase of the development and maintained and managed thereafter, in accordance with the approved Plan by a suitably constituted management company.

11. If within a period of 5 years 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.

12. All existing trees, shrubs and hedges on the western and eastern site boundary as shown on drawing no. 28B Landscaping Plan Phase 3 dated 19th February 2024 shall be permanently retained unless otherwise agreed in writing with the planning authority. All existing trees to be retained shall be protected by appropriate fencing in accordance with British Standard 5837:2012 – Trees in Relation to Design, Demolition and Construction and shall be maintained until all equipment, machinery and surplus materials have been removed from the site. Nothing shall be stored or placed in any area fenced in accordance with this condition and the ground levels within these areas shall not be altered, nor any excavation be made or any other works carried out, or fires lit within the prior written consent of the planning authority.

13. If any retained tree is removed, uprooted or destroyed or dies within five years from the date of completion of the development it shall be replaced within the next planting season by a tree or trees in the same location of a species and size to be agreed in writing with the planning authority.

The decision 2025/A0106 Appeal Site B Land to the rear (east) of 23 Mount Royal, Lisburn is based on the following drawings:

Drg. No.	LA05/2023/0501/F Drawing title	Scale	Council Received	Arch Dwg No.
01	Site Location Plan Phase 3	1:1250 @A2	9.6.23	2602- 050-01-07-001
02D	Proposed Site Plan Phase 3	1:500 @ A1	19.2.24	2602-050-04-04-02-002-03-017
04B	HT B- Site 22 Sketch Plan 2214sqft (ex. garage)	1:100	19.2.24	2602-010-16 -HT B-001
05B	HT B- Site 22 – Sketch Elevations	1:100	19.2.24	2602-010-16 -HT B-002
06B	HT B- Site 22 –Garage Sketch Plans and Elevations	1:100	19.2.24	2602-010-16 -HT B-003
07B	HT B-(h) Site 21 & 23 – Sketch Plans 2214sqft (excludes garages)	1:100	19.2.24	2602-010-16 -HTB (h)-004
08B	HT B-(h) Sites 21 & 23 – Sketch Elevations	1:100	19.2.24	2602-010-16 -HTB (h)-005
09B	HT B-(h) Sites 21 & 23 – Garage Sketch Plan & Elevations	1:100	19.2.24	2602-010-16 -HTB (h)-006
10B	HT C-(SL) Sites 28 & 29 – Sketch Plans 2849 sqft (excludes garages)	1:100	19.2.24	2602-010-16 -HT C (SL)- 001
11B	HT C-(SL) Sites 28 & 29 – Sketch Elevations	1:100	19.2.24	2602-010-16 -HT C (SL)- 002
12B	HT C-(SL) Garage Plan & Elevations Sites 28-30	1:100	19.2.24	2602-010-16 -HT C (SL)- 003
13B	HT E- (h) Sites 19, 20 & 25 – Sketch Plans 2556 sqft	1:100	19.2.24	2602-010-16 -HT E (h)- 001
14B	HT E- (h) Sites 19, 20 & 25	1:100	19.2.24	2602-010-15 -HT E

	– Sketch Elevations			(h)- 002
15B	HT E- (h) Garage sketch plans & elevations. Sites 19, 20 & 25	1:100	19.2.24	2602-010-16 -HT E (h)- 003
16C	HT E (SL) - Site 24 & 26 Sketch Plans (450 split) 2556 sq ft	1:100	19.2.24	2602-010-16-HT E (SL) - 010
17C	HT E (SL) - Site 24 & 26 Sketch Elevations (450 split)	1:100	19.2.24	2602-010-16-HT E (SL)-011
18C	HT E (h) - Garage Sketch Plans & Elevations, Site 24 & 26	1:100	19.2.24	2602-010-16-HT E (SL)-011A
19C	HT E (SL/H) - Site 27 Sketch Elevations (600 split)	1:100	19.2.24	2602-010-16-HT E (SL/H)-005
20C	HT E (SL/H) - Site 27 Sketch Plans (600 split) 2556 sq ft	1:100	19.2.24	2602-010-16-HT E (SL/H)-004
21C	HT E (SL/H) - Garage Sketch Plans & Elevations, Sites 27	1:100	19.2.24	602-010-16-HT E (SL/H)-006
22E	Proposed Site Sections A-D Phase 2 & 3	1:200 @ A0	19.2.24	2602-050-04-04-02-002-03-020
23C	Proposed Open Space Phase 2 & Phase 3	1:500 @A1	19.2.24	2602-050-04-04-02-002-03-021
24	Boundary Details Phase 3	1:500 @A2	9.6.23	2602-010-16-BD-001
25D	Proposed Boundary Treatments Phase 3	1:500 @A1	19.2.24	2602-050-04-04-02-002-03-019
26D	Proposed Car Parking Phase 3	1:500 @A1	19.2.24	2602-050-04-04-02-002-03-018
27E	Phase 3 Road Plan, Section and PSD Colouring	1:250 @A1	26.4.24	16-1375-1230 SWC Consulting
28B	Landscaping plan Phase 3	1:500 @A1	19.2.24	2602-050-04-04-02-002-03-024
29	HT C (SL) - Site 30 Sketch	1:100	19.2.24	2602-010-16 -HT C

	Elevations			(SL) - 005
30	HT C (SL) - Site 30 Sketch Plans 2849 sq ft (excludes garage)	1:100	19.2.24	2602-010-16-HT C (SL) -004
32	Phase 2 / 3 Proposed Drainage Plan	1:500 @A1	17.01.25	16-1375-1261 WSC Consulting
33	Phase 2 / 3 Proposed Drainage Storm Sections 1/1	1:500 @A1	17.01.25	16-1375-1262 WSC Consulting

COMMISSIONER CARRIE MCDONAGH

List of Documents

Planning Authority: -	"A" Statement of Case and Appendices "A1" Rebuttal and Appendices
Appellant: -	"B" Statement of Case and Appendices "B1" Rebuttal and Appendices
Third Party: -	"C" Statement of Case