Appeal Decision

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

Appeal Reference:	2025/A0110.
Appeal by:	FAWT Energy Ltd.
Appeal against:	The non-determination of an application for full planning permission.
Proposed Development:	Proposed replacement of existing wind turbine (approved under S/2013/0024/F) with a V52 turbine up to 850kw (up to a hub height of 40m and tip height of 67m) and electrical cabinets, hard standing area and all other associated ancillary works.
Location:	Approx. 151m South West from 11 Sheepwalk Road, Whitemountain, Lisburn.
Planning Authority:	Lisburn & Castlereagh City Council.
Application Reference:	LA05/2025/0481/F.
Procedure:	Informal Hearing on 15th April 2026.
Decision by:	Commissioner Kieran O'Connell, dated 2nd June 2026.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

2. A Claim for Costs was made by FAWT Energy Ltd against Lisburn & Castlereagh City Council in respect of this appeal. This claim is the subject of a separate decision.

Preliminary Matter

3. At the appeal hearing on 15th April 2026, the Council introduced evidence from its Environmental Health Section in support of its reason for refusal relating to noise. The Appellant contended that the introduction of this evidence at that stage, given its substantive nature, was prejudicial to their case.

4. Having regard to the interests of procedural fairness, and with the agreement of both parties, I accepted that the Appellant should be afforded the opportunity to submit a written response post hearing. I note that the Appellant duly provided that response. The Council was subsequently invited to comment on the additional material submitted. In response, the Council confirmed that it maintained its objection on noise grounds, but withdrew its second and fourth reasons for refusal, relating to impacts on bats, in light of further information received from NIEA's Natural Environment Division.

Reasons

5. The main issue in this appeal is whether the proposed development would have an unacceptable adverse impact on residential amenity having particular regard to noise.

6. Section 45(1) of the Planning Act (NI) 2011 (the Act) requires the Commission, in dealing with an appeal, to have regard to the local development plan (LDP) so far as material to the application and to any other material considerations. Section 6(4) of the Act states that where regard is to be had to the LDP, the determination must be made in accordance with the plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

7. The Lisburn and Castlereagh City Council Local Development Plan 2032 Plan Strategy (PS) sets out the strategic policy framework for the Council area. In line with the transitional arrangements set out in the Schedule to the Planning (Local Development Plan) Regulations (NI) 2015 (as amended), the Local Development Plan (LDP) now becomes a combination of the Departmental Development Plan (DDP) and the PS read together with any conflict resolved in favour of the PS.

8. The Lisburn Area Plan 2001 (LAP) operates as the DDP for the area in which the appeal site is 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. Within both the LAP and dBMAP, the appeal site is located within the countryside, outside of any settlement limit and within greenbelt. The LAP contains no policies relevant to the appeal proposal. It directs to the Planning Strategy for Rural Northern Ireland, which was superseded by Planning Policy Statement 21 – 'Sustainable Development in the Countryside' (PPS21), which in turn have been overtaken by the polices contained within the PS. The dBMAP also indicates that the site falls within an Area of Mineral Constraint and within the Belfast Hills – White Mountain Site of Local Nature Conservation Importance (Policy Designation 46/011).

9. No objections have been raised in relation to any of the site's designations under either the LAP or the dBMAP, and there is no evidence before me to suggest that the appeal proposal would conflict with the objectives of those designations. Accordingly, there is no conflict between the DDP and the PS. Consideration of the relevant provisions of the SPPS and the PS are set out further below.

10. On 11th December 2025, the Department for Infrastructure published the Strategic Planning Policy Statement for Northern Ireland, 'Planning for Sustainable Development' Edition 2 (SPPS) which includes new policy provisions on Renewable and Low Carbon Energy. The preamble makes it clear that all other policy provisions within the former SPPS are unchanged. The SPPS is material to all decisions on individual planning applications and appeals. Paragraph 1.9 of the SPPS states that where a Council has adopted its PS, existing policy retained under the transitional arrangements shall cease to have effect in the district of that Council. As the Council has adopted its PS, the previously retained regional policies, such as the Planning Policy Statements, have ceased to have effect within this Council area. Whilst Planning Policy Statement 18: Renewable Energy (August 2009) has been cancelled and is no longer in effect, the Best Practice Guidance to PPS18 - Renewable Energy continues to have effect.

11. The aim of the SPPS is to maximise sustainable renewable and low carbon energy from a wide range of technologies, at various scales, in appropriate locations within the built and natural environment, without compromising other environmental assets of acknowledged importance. At paragraph 6.220 it sets out several regional strategic objectives aimed to facilitate renewable energy development at appropriate locations in order to increase the contribution to the transition to a net zero carbon economy, in accordance with the Climate Change Act; while ensuring that environmental, landscape and amenity impacts amongst others are appropriately considered.

12. Paragraph 6.221 of the SPPS also states, "planning authorities must give *appropriate* weight to climate considerations and to supporting efforts to protect and enhance biodiversity" and they "must help facilitate delivery of the necessary increase in appropriate renewable and low carbon energy developments (electricity and heat) so that the contribution of this sector to the transition to a net zero energy is optimised." It further recognises that this approach "requires careful balancing of the local impacts with the wider environmental, economic, and social benefits."

13. Paragraph 6.230 of the SPPS goes on to say that "whilst advancements and changes in technology may mean schemes are not like for like, life extension and re-powering of existing development has the potential to maintain or enhance installed renewable energy generation, where appropriate. Significant weight will be given to the benefits of re-powering, expanding, and extending the life of existing solar and wind farms unless the impacts identified (including cumulative impacts) are unacceptable and cannot otherwise be made acceptable".

14. The appeal site lies within the countryside and is located approximately 151m south-west of 11 Sheepwalk Road. It comprises approximately 0.24 hectares within an improved agricultural field. Whitemountain Road Quarry is located immediately south of the site, and the surrounding area includes several dwellings, farm buildings and quarry-related infrastructure. Stoneyford Reservoir lies approximately 2.15km to the north-west.

15. A wind turbine with associated cabinets currently operates on the appeal site under planning permission S/2013/0024/F. This permission granted consent for a wind turbine with a hub height of 51.5m and a blade tip height of 65m and is proposed to be replaced with what the Appellant states is a more efficient model occupying the same footprint, with a reduced hub height (40m) and increased blade tip height (67m). A further approved and operational turbine is located on the same landholding.

16. Policy COU1 of the PS is titled 'Development in the Countryside'. It states that there are a range of types of development which, in principle, are considered to be acceptable in the countryside and that will contribute to the aims of sustainable development. While the appeal development does not fall into any of the specified types of development listed under the prescribed policies (COU 2-14), Policy COU1 allows for *'a range of other non-residential development proposals'* where they *'comply with all policy requirements contained in the operational policies, where relevant to the development'.*

17. Policy COU1 also requires that any proposal for development in the countryside will also be required to meet all of the general criteria set out in Policies COU15, 'Integration and Design of Buildings in the Countryside' and COU16, 'Rural Character and Other Criteria', whilst no objections have been raised regarding Policy COU1. The Council has, however, raised concern regarding Policy COU16 and is discussed further below.

18. The Council retains two reasons for refusal based on Policy RE1 'Renewable Energy Development' and Policy COU16, both in relation to alleged unacceptable adverse noise impact on residential amenity.

19. Policy RE1 permits renewable energy development where it does not result in an unacceptable adverse impact on matters including criterion (a) public safety, human health, or residential amenity. It also advises that in determining proposals, "the wider environmental, economic and social benefits" are material considerations to be "given appropriate weight." Although the policy restricts development on active peatland, no such issue arises in this case.

20. Policy COU16 requires that, "in all circumstances proposals for development in the countryside must be in accordance with and must not cause a detrimental change to or further erode the rural character of an area." The Council's objection relates solely to criterion (f), on the basis that it has not been demonstrated that the proposal would adversely affect residential amenity.

21. The accepted methodology for the assessment of wind turbine noise is set out in ETSU-R-97, as supplemented by the Institute of Acoustics (IoA) Good Practice Guide titled 'A Good Practice Guide to the Application of ETSU-R-97 for the Assessment and Rating of Wind Turbine Noise'. Whilst compliance with ETSU-R-97 does not require absolute certainty or formal certification, it does, however, require, sufficient evidence to enable a planning judgment to be reached on the balance of probabilities, including sufficiently evidenced turbine source data, representative and reliable background noise measurements and a reasonable degree of confidence that derived limits will protect residential amenity in practice. Compliance with ETSU-R-97 therefore depends not only on the application of the methodology, but critically on the robustness and reliability of the underlying evidential inputs used to derive both predicted noise levels and background noise limits.

22. The Appellant submitted a Noise Impact Assessment (NIA), supported by post-hearing clarification, which concludes that predicted noise levels would comply with ETSU-R-97 derived limits. Whilst the NIA adopts an established methodological framework, adherence to methodology does not in itself demonstrate compliance where the underlying inputs are not demonstrated to be sufficiently reliable or representative.

23. Having considered the detailed and competing technical evidence before me, including the Environmental Health post-hearing response and the Appellant's post-hearing memo dated 22nd April 2026, the Appellant disputes the conclusions reached by Environmental Health, the central question is whether, on the balance of probabilities, the information before me provides a sufficiently robust evidential basis to demonstrate compliance with ETSU-R-97. This is not a comparative exercise between competing technical positions, but an assessment of whether

the Appellant has discharged the evidential burden placed upon it. It is not necessary for harm to be established with certainty. It is sufficient that, on the balance of probabilities, there is a realistic likelihood that ETSU-R-97 derived noise limits would not be achieved, such that residential amenity would not be adequately protected.

24. Environmental Health identifies several substantive shortcomings in the turbine source data provided in the March 2025 NIA and states that it is 'very limited' and akin to the level of detail provided in a sales brochure rather than a technical noise assessment. They note that the sound power levels are presented predominantly in graphical form, without corresponding numerical values across discrete wind speeds and appear to be generic in nature rather than warranted turbine sound power levels derived from certified manufacturer testing (e.g. IEC 61400-11). In addition, they advise that there is a lack of clarity regarding the application of ETSU-R-97 corrections, such as tonal penalties and the derivation of rating levels having been applied. Individually and cumulatively, these matters go directly to the reliability of the predicted noise emissions, and therefore to the ability of the decision-maker to conclude, on the balance of probabilities, that ETSU-R-97 limits would be met.

25. Environmental Health also raised concerns that when alternative assumptions and corrections consistent with ETSU-R-97 good practice are applied, materially higher sound power levels may arise than those relied upon in the NIA and that such outcomes are derived using assumptions aligned with recognised ETSU-R-97 good practice guidance.

26. The Appellant argues that the turbine specification used within the NIA has been used in other assessments and represents a valid basis for modelling. I also note the Appellant's contention that Environmental Health has relied upon an alternative or revised turbine specification introduced at a late stage in the process, that such an approach is not reflective of standard assessment practice, and that these matters were not identified in earlier consultation responses.

27. However, regardless as to whether the methodology has been used elsewhere, the crux of the matter is whether it provides a sufficiently reliable basis in this case having regard to ETSU-R-97 guidance. The use of an approach in other cases does not, in itself, demonstrate that the inputs relied upon here are sufficiently evidenced, verifiable or representative of likely conditions at this site.

28. In these circumstances, even if I were to accept that the Appellant has used a specification that has been relied upon in other assessments, and that Environmental Health's approach reflects a different or more conservative interpretation of the turbine specification, the fundamental issue remains whether the evidence before me demonstrates, on the balance of probabilities, that the turbine noise inputs used within the NIA are sufficiently robust, verified and representative to demonstrate compliance with ETSU-R-97. In particular, it has not been demonstrated that the sound power levels relied upon correspond to clearly evidenced and confirmed turbine operating parameters under assumed operating conditions. This reinforces my view that the Appellant's assessment does not provide a sufficiently reliable basis to conclude compliance.

29. Even if I were to accept the Appellant's sound power levels as a reasonable representation of the turbine specification, this would not, of itself, resolve the evidential concerns identified. The issue is not simply the selection of one set of inputs over another, but whether the evidence as a whole provides sufficient certainty, on the balance of probabilities, to conclude that ETSU-R-97 derived noise limits would be met in practice. ETSU-R-97 compliance depends not only on the application of methodology, but on the robustness of the underlying input assumptions from which both predicted noise levels and derived limits are established. This is considered further below.

30. In this respect, I am not persuaded that sufficiently clear and evidenced source data for the proposed turbine has been provided, such as recognised or sufficiently evidenced source data (for example IEC compliant testing or equivalent robust manufacturer information) to demonstrate that the inputs relied upon represent an accurate or conservative assessment of likely noise emissions, or to reconcile the materially different outcomes identified under alternative, but plausible, ETSU-R-97 consistent assumptions. In the absence of such clearly evidenced data, I am not persuaded that the inputs relied upon represent a realistic worst case assessment or appropriately capture potential operational variability.

31. Having regard to the range of plausible outcomes identified within the evidence before me, I am not persuaded that the turbine noise inputs relied upon are sufficiently reliable to demonstrate compliance with ETSU-R-97. Moreover, the evidence before me, including the application of alternative ETSU-R-97 consistent assumptions, indicates that materially higher noise emissions remain a plausible and credible outcome. This is not a matter of minor technical disagreement but a fundamental issue which undermines the reliability of the predicted noise levels. In circumstances where such uncertainty exists, ETSU-R-97 requires a precautionary approach to ensure that noise effects are not underestimated. Accordingly, I am not persuaded, on the balance of probabilities, that ETSU-R-97 limits would be met in practice. In this context, it is not necessary to identify a single definitive exceedance scenario. The existence of a realistic and credible risk of exceedance, arising from unresolved evidential uncertainty, is sufficient to conclude that compliance has not been demonstrated.

32. In considering the Appellant's NIA in the context of ETSU-R-97 and the IoA Good Practice Guide, I am not persuaded that appropriate allowance has been made for evidential uncertainties inherent in the assessment. In particular, the turbine source data is not supported by clearly verified or IEC-compliant testing; there is no explicit accounting for tonal characteristics or amplitude modulation; and no adjustment or sensitivity testing has been undertaken to address, or test, the potential influence of vegetation on measured background noise levels. Furthermore, whilst the subtraction of existing turbine noise is, in principle, an accepted approach, insufficient detail has been provided to demonstrate that this has been applied in a transparent and verifiable manner. Taken together, these matters suggest a departure from the precautionary approach required by ETSU-R-97 and the Good Practice Guide where uncertainty exists, and limit confidence that the predicted noise levels represent a realistic and robust worst-case scenario.

33. The derivation of ETSU-R-97 limits depends upon representative background noise measurements. It is common case that monitoring was undertaken in proximity to vegetation. The key issue, therefore, is whether it has been adequately demonstrated that such positioning has not materially influenced the measured background noise levels.

34. The Institute of Acoustics (IoA) Good Practice Guide to ETSU-R-97 advises, as the parties recognise, that background noise monitoring surveys should be carried out at locations representative of the noise-sensitive receptors and should avoid features liable to introduce localised noise effects, including vegetation, which may give rise to turbulence-induced noise. Failure to do so may result in inflated background noise levels and, consequently, artificially elevated ETSU-R-97 limits, thereby reducing confidence that the derived limits provide a robust basis for assessing turbine noise impact and reducing the margin of protection afforded to nearby residential receptors by potentially masking exceedances in practice.

35. The Appellant contends that the monitoring location used was appropriate, noting that it was situated further from the more dominant existing road traffic noise sources in the study area, that vegetation is ubiquitous in any rural setting and that it would be 'difficult to see how a small number of hedges in relative close proximity to the meter location could have such a disproportional influence on measured noise levels'. I also note the Appellant's submission that this matter had previously been raised but not substantively addressed by Environmental Health. However, this does not displace the need for me to determine, on the evidence before me at this stage, whether the background noise data has been demonstrated, with sufficient evidence, to be representative and reliable.

36. In the evidential context before me, I am not persuaded by the Appellant's contention that vegetation effects are immaterial. No persuasive evidence has been provided to demonstrate that the monitoring location was representative of conditions at noise-sensitive receptors, or that any influence from localised noise sources is immaterial or has been adequately excluded or quantified. Accordingly, I am not persuaded, on the evidence before me, that the background noise dataset is representative of free-field conditions at nearby receptors.

37. In reaching this conclusion, I find Environmental Health's evidence to be persuasive in explaining how nearby vegetation can influence recorded background noise through wind-induced effects, particularly as it is grounded in recognised acoustic principles and reflected in the IoA Good Practice Guide to ETSU-R-97. While rainfall data was subsequently provided by the Appellant in post-hearing submissions, this does not address, and therefore does not overcome, the fundamental concern regarding the representativeness and reliability of the background noise dataset as a basis for deriving ETSU-R-97 limits as the provision of additional data does not resolve the underlying issue of whether the monitoring location itself was appropriate in accordance with best practice guidance.

38. In these circumstances, the recorded background noise levels cannot be assumed to be representative of free-field conditions at noise-sensitive receptors. The background noise dataset is subject to unresolved uncertainty, giving rise to a credible evidential risk that background noise levels may have been overstated in the particular context of this site, with the consequence that ETSU-R-97 derived

noise limits may be inflated and afford a reduced level of protection to residential receptors, such that apparent compliance with those limits would not provide confidence that residential amenity is adequately safeguarded. Accordingly, I consider that further background noise monitoring at a more representative free-field location would be proportionate and consistent with best practice guidance.

39. When considered cumulatively, these evidential uncertainties are not isolated but interrelated. There is sufficient evidence to indicate, on the balance of probabilities, that turbine noise inputs may be understated and background noise levels may be overstated. Taken together, these matters indicate a realistic likelihood that the inputs relied upon do not reflect likely conditions at nearby residential receptors, with the consequence that apparent compliance with ETSU-R-97 derived noise limits cannot be relied upon. In these circumstances, I am not persuaded, on the balance of probabilities, that the proposed development would comply with ETSU-R-97 or that residential amenity would be adequately protected.

40. Turning to the assessment of predicted turbine noise levels, I note and accept that the principle of accounting for the influence of existing wind turbines on background noise, including through the subtraction of predicted turbine noise from measured background levels, is well established within ETSU-R-97 and the associated Good Practice Guide and can, in appropriate circumstances, provide a valid methodological approach. I note the Appellant's submission that this approach has been applied through the subtraction of predicted noise from the existing turbine, as set out within the Noise Impact Assessment. However, I am not persuaded that sufficient detail or clarity has been provided to demonstrate that this approach has been applied in a robust or verifiable manner in accordance with the Good Practice Guide, such that its results can be relied upon with confidence particularly given the absence of sufficient transparency in how the adjustment has been derived and applied.

41. Against this evidential backdrop and having regard to the uncertainties identified in both the turbine source data and background noise measurements, I am not persuaded that a reliable baseline has been established. Consequently, I cannot conclude with confidence that the proposed turbine would not give rise to a material increase in noise levels relative to the existing turbine. Furthermore, there remains a realistic prospect, on the evidence before me and applying ETSU-R-97 on a precautionary basis, of a worsening of noise conditions, particularly if turbine noise has been underestimated at nearby residential receptors, with a corresponding adverse effect on residential amenity. This conclusion is consistent with Environmental Health's assessment that, where appropriate ETSU-R-97 corrections are applied, the proposed turbine is likely to exceed derived noise limits. Taken together, I find, on the balance of probabilities, that the proposal would give rise to exceedances of ETSU-R-97 derived noise limits, with consequent harm to residential amenity.

42. Even if I were to consider whether the identified likelihood of harm could reasonably be addressed through the imposition of planning conditions, including operational noise limits, post-installation compliance testing and mitigation measures, I am not persuaded that such an approach would be appropriate in this instance. Conditions are intended to control and verify compliance; they cannot substitute for the absence of a reliable evidential basis or remedy deficiencies in

the information required to derive appropriate and enforceable noise limits. In the absence of a reliable evidential baseline, any such condition would be fundamentally unsound. In particular, Environmental Health evidence demonstrates that the noise modelling is based on materially underestimated inputs. In these circumstances, any ETSU-R-97 based condition could not be shown to be effective or enforceable in safeguarding residential amenity. To grant permission would therefore risk deferring the assessment of acceptability beyond the decision stage, which would be inappropriate. This conclusion is consistent with the Council's evidence, which records that Environmental Health, having reviewed the further information submitted, maintained the view that, with appropriate ETSU-R-97 corrections applied, the proposed turbine is likely to exceed the derived noise limits and does not remedy fundamental shortcomings in the data used to derive those limits in the first instance.

43. For the reasons given, I find that the proposal has failed to demonstrate, on a robust evidential basis, compliance with ETSU-R-97. I have had regard to the predicted noise levels presented by the Appellant, including those set out within the post-hearing submissions; however, I do not consider that these predictions can be relied upon, as they are derived from inputs which have not been demonstrated to be sufficiently robust or representative. In these circumstances, I find that there is a realistic prospect that operational noise levels at nearby residential receptors would exceed ETSU-R-97 derived noise limits, with consequent risk of unacceptable adverse impact on residential amenity.

44. Notwithstanding my conclusions above, the Appellant advanced several undisputed benefits of the appeal proposal which weigh in favour of the appeal development. The Appellant also contends that, together with the SPPS requirements to maximise renewable potential and meet climate change obligations, these benefits would outweigh any harm that may arise from the appeal proposal. I have given careful consideration to the benefits advanced by the Appellant, including increased renewable electricity generation, reduced greenhouse gas emissions, enhanced energy security, economic investment, farm diversification, employment creation and the claimed 82% increase in energy output over the existing turbine.

45. Whilst the SPPS affords support to renewable energy development in principle, policy support within the SPPS is explicitly qualified by the requirement at paragraph 6.223 that such development does not give rise to unacceptable adverse impacts on several matters, including those on residential amenity. Such provision is reiterated again at paragraph 6.230 of the SPPS in relation to giving significant weight to repowering of turbines unless the impacts identified (including cumulative impacts) are unacceptable and cannot otherwise be made acceptable.

46. Where unacceptable harm to residential amenity is identified and cannot be satisfactorily mitigated, the policy does not support granting permission where impacts on residential amenity are found to be unacceptable following the balancing of all material considerations and where such impacts cannot be satisfactorily mitigated. Whilst significant weight is afforded to the benefits of repowering under the SPPS, that provision does not displace the requirement that development must not give rise to unacceptable adverse impacts. In circumstances where compliance with this objective has not been demonstrated, I am not persuaded that the acknowledged renewable energy and climate change

benefits, even when given significant weight, are capable of outweighing that harm, as to do so would be contrary to the SPPS.

47. In undertaking the required planning balance, I have given significant weight in the planning balance to the renewable energy and climate change benefits of the proposal, including the repowering of an existing turbine in accordance with paragraph 6.230 of the SPPS. However, I must weigh those benefits against the nature and degree of the likely harm identified. These benefits do not alter my conclusion on the likely acceptability of the proposal, as they do not remedy the unresolved evidential deficiencies identified above. Even giving these benefits significant weight, the identified harm arises from the failure to demonstrate, on a robust evidential basis, that ETSU-R-97 derived noise limits would be complied with, and from the realistic prospect that such limits may be exceeded. In the absence of persuasive evidence demonstrating that such harm could be avoided or effectively mitigated, I find that the identified impacts would be unacceptable. In those circumstances, and applying the policy as a whole, the harm is such that it outweighs the benefits of the proposal.

48. Taking these matters together and having regard to the totality of detailed technical evidence before me, I am not persuaded, for the reasons set out above, that it has been adequately demonstrated that the proposal would comply with ETSU-R-97 or that residential amenity would be adequately protected. Rather, I find on the balance of probabilities that there is a realistic likelihood, based on the evidence provided and for the reasons set out above, of exceedance of ETSU-R-97 derived limits and consequent unacceptable impacts on residential amenity.

49. For the reasons given above and having had regard to the provisions of Policy RE1 and Policy COU16 of the PS, the LDP read as a whole, the SPPS, and all other material considerations, I find that the appeal proposal has not adequately demonstrated that residential amenity would be protected or that unacceptable adverse noise impacts would be avoided. Furthermore, such impacts have not been shown to be capable of being appropriately controlled by condition, in a manner that would provide certainty that residential amenity would be protected.

50. The appeal is therefore dismissed.

This decision is based on the following drawings:

PL-01 B, Location Plan, 1:2500 Scale
PL-02, Block Plan, 1:500 Scale
PL-03,Turbine Elevations, 1:500 Scale
PL-04,Shadow Flicker Assessment, 1:5000 Scale

COMMISSIONER KIERAN O'CONNELL

List of Appearances

Planning Authority:-	Callum Henderson (Lisburn & Castlereagh City Council).
	Gillian Milligan (Lisburn & Castlereagh City Council).
	Vicky Elliot (Lisburn & Castlereagh City Council Environmental Health Section).
Appellant:-	Sarah Mc Dowell Resolve Planning.
	Stephen Cleary (Alive Environmental).
	Cormac Loughran (Blackstaff Ecology).

List of Documents

Planning Authority: -	Statement of Case and associated appendices by Lisburn & Castlereagh City Council.
	Post-Hearing Statements by Lisburn & Castlereagh City Council.
Appellant: -	Statement of Case and associated appendices by Resolve Planning.
	Post-Hearing Statements by Resolve Planning.