

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 28 February 2014 11:48  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Cc:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** RE: Z/2013/0749/F

[REDACTED]

Having discussed this matter with [REDACTED], I am content that as there is a live approval on the same site (Z/2011/1287/F) which will be superseded by this current application (Z/2013/0749/F) there would be no deemed intensification in the use of the access.

Please note however, any further applications on adjoining sites which utilise the same access would be deemed to have an intensification.

I hope this is of help.

Thank you.

[REDACTED] Network Planning, Roads Service, 4 Hospital Road, Hydebank, Belfast. BT8 8JL [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 26 February 2014 16:05  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Z/2013/0749/F

Dear [REDACTED]

With reference to application Z/2013/0749/F (Lands to the rear of 26-30 Belmont Avenue- history on site includes Z/2001/1287/F and Z/2006/2739/O), and consultation response dated 14<sup>th</sup> August 2013 please confirm Roads Service's current position on the application?

Thank you.

Regards,

[REDACTED]

Sent 25/9/13

[REDACTED]  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** RE: Z/2013/0749/F

[REDACTED]  
Sorry for the slight delay in replying.

I have now studied the various histories etc and basically we assessed this application based on the factors below.

The existing lane currently serves 7 properties with vehicular accesses and this proposal would add another, i.e. intensification of greater than 5%.

Although Roads Service had previously not objected to the proposal, we now are satisfied that the issue of intensification had not been discussed in previous applications and therefore that we should seek DCAN 15 standard where the access road meets the adopted Earlswood Road.

The DCAN 15 visibility for this location is 2 x 33 metres and the achievable visibility estimated on site is around 2 x 5 metres which is well short of the required.

I would suggest that we are content to stand over our reply of 14 Aug 2013, however, if DOE Planning deem the intensification of use is not a material consideration, then the response can be amended accordingly.

Hope this is helpful but feel free to discuss.

Regards

[REDACTED]  

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 23 September 2013 15:05  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Z/2013/0749/F

Dear [REDACTED]

With regards to the application Z/2013/0749/F for one detached dwelling i have received your response dated 11/08/13 detailing 2 reasons for refusal. There is history on the site under Z/2011/1287/F which is an approval for a detached dwelling. We were wondering basically why there is such a difference?

Thank you

Regards,

4 bed detached house.

Change of house type to that approved under 2/13/0749/F.

2/13/0749/F - No conditions / information included in decision.

2/11/1287/F - Hands parking conditions.

Change of house type to that previously approved - while the submitted drawing is not dimensioned, reading the drawing indicates sufficient space within the double garage to accommodate 2 cars + additional space within the courtyard to the frontage to accommodate further parking. Access of acceptable width onto private driveway with sufficient width on driveway to accommodate manoeuvring. Conditions - Hands parking for parking. Dog 02 26/01/16.

04/03/16