NEWRY MOURNE AND DOWN DISTRICT COUNCIL

Ref: P/

Minutes of Planning Committee Meeting of Newry, Mourne and Down District Council held on Wednesday 7 October 2026 at 10am in the Council Chamber, Downshire Civic Centre, Downpatrick.

Chairperson:	Councillor M Larkin	
Committee Members in attendance in Chamber:	Councillor O Magennis	Councillor D McAteer
	Councillor H Reilly	Councillor M Rice
Committee Members in attendance via Teams:	Councillor W Clarke	Councillor L Devlin
	Councillor S Murphy	Councillor J Tinnelly
	Councillor H Young	

Officials in attendance:
Mr C Mallon, Director of Economy, Regeneration & Tourism
Mr J McGilly, Assistant Director: Regeneration
Ms E Kirk, Assistant Director: People & Legal
Mrs A McAlarney, Planning Manager
Ms B Ferguson, Senior Planning Officer
Mrs A Loughan, Senior Planning Officer
Mrs P Manley, Senior Planning Officer
Mr P Rooney, Head of Legal Administration
Miss S Taggart, Democratic Services Manager
Ms F Branagh, Democratic Services Officer

Officials in attendance via Teams: Mr M McQuiston, Senior Planning Officer

P/071/2026: APOLOGIES AND CHAIRPERSON'S REMARKS

An apology was received from Councillor Harte.

P/072/2026: DECLARATONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

P/073/2026: DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN ACCORDANCE WITH PLANNING COMMITTEE PROTOCOL- PARAGRAPH 25

Item 6 - Cllrs Devlin, Harte, Larkin, McAteer, Reilly & Young attended site visit on 2 September 2026.

Items 7 & 8 – Cllrs Harte, Larkin, Magennis, McAteer, S Murphy, Tinnelly & Young attended a site visit on 29 September 2026.

MINUTES FOR CONFIRMATION

P/074/2026: **MINUTES OF PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING OF WEDNESDAY 2 SEPTEMBER 2026**

Read: Minutes of Planning Committee Meeting of Wednesday 2 September 2026. (Copy circulated)

AGREED: **On the proposal of Councillor McAteer, seconded by Councillor Rice, it was agreed to adopt the Minutes of the Planning Committee Meeting of Wednesday 2 September 2026 as a true and accurate record.**

FOR DISCUSSION/DECISION

P/075/2026: **ADDENDUM LIST**

Read: Addendum List of Planning Applications with no representations received or requests for speaking rights – Wednesday 7 October 2026. (Copy circulated)

There were no applications on the addendum list.

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT

P/076/2026: **PLANNING APPLICATIONS FOR DETERMINATION WITH PREVIOUS SITE VISITS**

(1) LA07/2025/0057/O

On agenda as a result of the Call-in Process. Previously tabled August 2026

Location:
Approx. 28m N of 51 Derryboy Road, Crossgar, BT30 9LH

Proposal:
Site for dwelling with access on to Holly Park Road.

Conclusion and Recommendation from Planning Official:
Approval.

Power-point presentation:
Mrs Ferguson reminded members of the details of the application, noting that no representations had been received and consultees had raised no objections, subject to conditions. She advised that the proposal had been assessed under Policy CTY 2A; however, officers did not consider that an appropriate cluster existed at the location. She noted that the site was not visually linked to the wider group of buildings, did not represent the rounding off of an existing cluster and would extend development into the open countryside. She confirmed that it was the opinion of the Planning Department that the application failed to satisfy the remaining criteria of Policy CTY 2A and was therefore recommended for refusal.

Speaking rights:
In line with the Operating Protocol, no further speaking rights were permitted on the application.

Mr Gerry Tumelty, supported by Mr and Mrs Gibson (applicants) were present to answer any questions Members may have had.

As there were no questions, Councillor McAteer proposed to accept the officer recommendations, which was seconded by Councillor Larkin.

The proposal was put to a vote by way of a show of hands and voting was as follows:

FOR:	4
AGAINST:	1
ABSTENTIONS:	0

The proposal was declared carried.

AGREED: **On the proposal of Councillor McAteer, seconded by Councillor Larkin, it was agreed to issue a refusal in respect of planning application LA07/2025/0057/O supporting officer recommendation as contained in the Case Officer Report.**

Cllr Devlin left the meeting at this stage – 10.22am

(2) LA07/2025/0897/O

On agenda as a result of the Call in Process. Previously tabled September 2026.

Location:
Immediately N of 46 Forkhill Road, Cloghoge, Newry, BT35 8LZ

Proposal:
Infill site for two dwellings.

Conclusion and Recommendation from Planning Official:
Refusal

Power-point presentation:
Mrs Loughan reminded Members of the details of the application following the site visit, noting that no representations had been received and consultees had raised no objections. She reminded Members that the site was located outside the settlement limits of Newtowncloghoge and within the Ring of Gullion AONB and was therefore assessed under the SPPS and PPS 21.

Mrs Loughan advised that, whilst the proposal had been submitted as an infill opportunity under Policy CTY 8, officers considered that the site did not represent a genuine infill opportunity within a substantial and continuously built-up frontage (SCBUF). She stated that the proposal relied on development within the adjacent settlement to establish the frontage required to justify infill development, contrary to the policy distinction between settlements and the countryside. She advised that the proposal failed to comply with Policies CTY 1, 8 and 15 and was therefore recommended for refusal.

Speaking rights:

In line with the Operating Protocol, no further speaking rights were permitted on the application.

Mr John Cole was present to answer any questions Members may have had.

Councillor Tinnelly queried whether the nearby commercial enterprise was considered part of the settlement, to which Mrs Loughan confirmed that it was sited outside the settlement boundary.

Councillor Tinnelly proposed to overturn the recommendation to an approval stating that he believed that the site read as part of the settlement limit, therefore the refusal reasons CTY1 and 8 fell away. This was seconded by Councillor Larkin.

Councillor Reilly requested clarification for voting on an application when he wasn't present at the site visit.

Councillor Larkin confirmed that, based on legal advice, it was at Members' discretion whether to participate in the vote, provided they were content that they had sufficient knowledge of the application and its relevant details.

The proposal was put to a vote by way of a show of hands and voting was as follows:

FOR:	6
AGAINST:	0
ABSTENTIONS:	0

The proposal was declared carried.

AGREED: **On the proposal of Councillor Tinnelly, seconded by Councillor Larkin, it was agreed to issue an approval in respect of planning application LA07/2025/0897/O contrary to officer recommendation as contained in the Case Officer Report.**

It was also agreed that Planning Officers be delegated authority to impose any relevant conditions.

(3) LA07/2025/0308/O

On agenda as a result of the Call in Process

Location:
To the rear of 8 Hospital Road, Carnagat, Newry, BT35 8PW

Proposal:
Site for dwelling and carport

Conclusion and Recommendation from Planning Official:
Refusal

Power-point presentation:
Mrs Loughan reminded Members of the details of the application following a site visit, noting that no representations had been received and consultees had raised no objections. She reminded Members that the site was located within the Newry settlement limit and had been assessed against the relevant policies of the SPPS, PPS 7, the Addendum to PPS 7 and PPS 6, reiterating that indicative drawings demonstrated that any dwelling on the site would occupy a prominent position and would require significant excavation, land regrading and retaining structures.

Mrs Loughan stated that the proposal would be out of keeping with the established pattern of development along Hospital Road and that the extent of groundworks, retaining features and removal of existing vegetation would be visually intrusive and harmful to the character

and environmental quality of the area and was therefore recommended for refusal as it failed to comply with Policies QD1 and LC1.

Speaking rights:

In line with the Operating Protocol, no further speaking rights were permitted on the application.

Mr Colin O'Callaghan was present to answer any questions Members may have had.

As there were no questions, Councillor McAteer proposed to accept the officer's recommendations. This was seconded by Councillor Larkin.

The proposal was put to a vote by way of a show of hands and voting was as follows:

FOR:	7
AGAINST:	0
ABSTENTIONS:	0

The proposal was declared carried.

AGREED: **On the proposal of Councillor McAteer, seconded by Councillor Larkin, it was agreed to issue a refusal in respect of planning application LA07/2024/0308/O supporting officer recommendation as contained in the Case Officer Report.**

P/077/2026: **PLANNING APPLICATIONS FOR DETERMINATION**

(1) LA07/2024/0583/F

On agenda as a result of the Operating Protocol and Scheme of Delegation

Location:
Lands to rear and NE of No.21 and N of Nos.15 & 17 Bonds Road, Silverbridge, Armagh, BT35 9PE

Proposal:
Retention of ground works including changes to the level of the land through inert infilling and reprofiling of land; proposed levelling with topsoil and seeding with grass for the purposes of agricultural land improvement on lands to the rear and NE of No 21 and North of Nos 15 & 17 Bonds Road; and creation of new vehicular access to Bonds Road (amended description)

Conclusion and Recommendation from Planning Official:
Approval

Power-point presentation:
Mrs Manley presented the application, advising that that the site was located in the countryside and within an AONB and confirmed that the detailed case officer's report was taken as read.

Mrs Manley outlined that the submitted plans detailed the extent of the groundworks, changes in land levels, areas of inert clay fill and proposed finished ground levels. She advised that six letters of objection had been received raising concerns relating to archaeological and heritage impacts, compliance with planning policy, the retrospective nature of the development, environmental and biodiversity impacts, landscape and AONB impacts, traffic and residential amenity, tourism impacts, land ownership and the planning process and confirmed that these matters had been considered as part of the assessment of the application.

Mrs Manley advised that consultations had been undertaken with Historic Environment Division, NIEA, DFI Roads, Rivers Agency, Environmental Health and Shared Environmental Services, with no objections raised subject to conditions where applicable. She further advised that the application had been assessed against the relevant planning policy framework, the Area Plan, consultation responses, representations received and other material considerations with a resulting recommendation for approval.

Speaking rights:

In Support:

Mr Graham, supported by Mr Oliver Hearty (applicant), spoke in support of the officer recommendation and advised that the proposal sought retention of groundworks undertaken to improve the quality of low-lying agricultural land and facilitate more efficient farming practices. He stated that the infilling works involved stone and rock material rather than waste material and represented the minimum works required to make the land suitable for agricultural use, and that infill within the floodplain would be removed and restored in accordance with Rivers Agency requirements.

Mr Graham highlighted that consultees had raised no objections subject to conditions and that the proposal would not result in adverse environmental, landscape, amenity or archaeological impacts.

As there were no questions, Councillor Larkin proposed to accept the officer's recommendations within the case officer's report. This was seconded by Councillor Magennis.

The proposal was put to a vote by way of a show of hands and voting was as follows:

FOR:	7
AGAINST:	0
ABSTENTIONS:	1

The proposal was declared carried.

AGREED: **On the proposal of Councillor Larkin, seconded by Councillor Magennis, it was agreed to issue an approval in respect of planning application LA07/2024/0583/F supporting officer recommendation as contained in the Case Officer Report.**

Cllr Clarke left the meeting during discussion on the above item – 10.42am

(2) LA07/2025/1367/O

On agenda as a result of the Call in Process

Location:
Site 10m E. No.2 Mullaghans Road, Mullaghbawn, Newry

Proposal:
Dwelling within an existing cluster

Conclusion and Recommendation from Planning Official:
Refusal

Power-point presentation:
Mrs Loughan presented the application that sought planning permission for a dwelling and garage on lands 10m east of No. 2 Mullaghans Road, Mullaghbawn. She noted that four letters of objection had been received, raising concerns regarding the impact on a nearby agricultural business, visual and landscape impacts within the Ring of Gullion AONB, roads issues and the potential precedent for further development in the area.

Mrs Loughan advised that the site was located within the open countryside and the Ring of Gullion AONB and had been assessed under PPS 21, CTY 2A which required all criteria to be met to permit a dwelling within an existing cluster and stated that officers did not consider an existing cluster to be present at the location. She noted that the nearby dwellings were dispersed in nature, separated from the site by the public road and did not appear as a coherent visual entity within the landscape.

Mrs Loughan further advised that the site lacked enclosure, was not bounded by development on any side and would not represent the rounding off or consolidation of an existing cluster, rather that the proposal would introduce a prominent dwelling into the open countryside, erode an important visual break and have a detrimental impact on rural character and the AONB. She concluded that the proposal failed to comply with Policies CTY 1, 2A, 13 and 14 of PPS 21 and Policy NH 6 of PPS 2 and was therefore recommended for refusal for the reasons set out in the Case Officer Report.

Speaking rights:

In Support:

Mr O'Callaghan spoke in support of the application, disagreeing with the officer assessment, stating that the site was located at an existing cluster and focal point and that the nearby road junction should be considered a crossroads for the purposes of the policy. He stated that the proposal would represent the rounding off and consolidation of existing development rather than an encroachment into the open countryside, arguing that the site benefited from existing boundaries, surrounding development and a strong sense of enclosure and would not appear conspicuous within the landscape.

Mr O'Callaghan further argued that the site formed part of an established grouping of development associated with the nearby junction and that the proposal complied with the overall intent of Policy CTY 2A. he made reference to previous planning approvals, PAC decisions and case law which he considered supported a more flexible interpretation of the policy criteria. (2014/A0245; 2021/A0010; 2017/A0222; 2010/A0202)

Mr O'Callaghan also raised concerns regarding the assessment of the application, stating that he believed that insufficient weight had been given to information submitted in support of the proposal regarding similar applications that had been approved within the District.

Councillor McAteer requested clarification on whether the junction of Mill Road and Mullans Road could be regarded as a crossroads and, therefore, a focal point, and queried the interpretation that the site was bounded by buildings on two sides, given the location of the buildings on either side of the road.

Mr O'Callaghan advised that, although the site was not physically adjoining to surrounding development, this was due to the road layout and the realignment of the junction and he believed that the site formed part of the crossroads setting and was effectively bounded by nearby development. He further advised that the policy did not require buildings to be physically touching the site and, in his view, the proposal met the intent of the policy.

Councillor McAteer queried the extent to which the Court of Appeal judgement could be relied upon as guidance in the current case, noting the reliance on the interpretation of the word bounded and the fact that it was an English court ruling.

Mr Rooney advised that the Court of Appeal case was an English judgement and referred to development being immediately adjoining rather than bounded and stated that the term 'bounded' within the policy should be given its ordinary dictionary meaning and noted that the Court had endorsed that general approach. He confirmed that Members were not bound by the Court of Appeal decision and could reach their own interpretation of the policy, noting that the term bounded suggested a degree of attachment or bordering, while acknowledging that both the Planning Department and the applicant had presented their respective interpretations for Members' consideration.

Councillor Tinnelly requested further information on Mr O'Callaghan's assertion that no consideration had been given to supporting information submitted during the processing of the application.

Mrs Loughan advised that the information submitted by the agent had been fully considered, however the Planning Department did not consider the examples provided to be comparable to the application site. She noted that there was no development immediately surrounding the staggered crossroads and that the examples provided relied on development located further along the road. She confirmed that each application must be assessed on its own merits and confirmed that, although this was not explicitly detailed in the report, all submitted information had been taken into account in reaching the recommendation.

Councillor Magennis proposed a site visit to allow Members to view the application site in person to better understand the views that had been discussed. This was seconded by Councillor Reilly.

The proposal was put to a vote by way of a show of hands and voting was as follows:

FOR:	8
AGAINST:	0
ABSTENTIONS:	0

The proposal was declared carried.

AGREED: **On the proposal of Councillor Magennis, seconded by Councillor Reilly, it was agreed to defer planning application LA07/2025/1367/O to allow for a site visit.**

(3) LA07/2024/1097/O

On agenda as a result of the Call in Process

Location:
Lands between 69 & 73 Ballywillin Road, Crossgar, BT30 9LF

Proposal:
Proposed 2 No. dwellings and garages on infill site under Policy CTY8 of PPS 21

Conclusion and Recommendation from Planning Official:
Refusal

Power-point presentation:
Mrs Ferguson presented the application, stating that the Case Officer Report was taken as read and highlighted that no objections had been received from consultees. She acknowledged that the site was located within the countryside and that, whilst the proposal was considered to satisfy the infill criteria of Policy CTY 8, all countryside development must also integrate sympathetically with its surroundings and comply with other planning and environmental requirements.

Mrs Ferguson advised that the site was located on a steeply sloping roadside site and that the submitted sections demonstrated that significant excavation, regrading and landform modification would be required to accommodate the proposed dwellings. She stated that the dwellings could not be accommodated within the existing landform without substantial alteration and that the extent of cut and fill works was considered excessive. She further advised that the proposal failed to comply with Policies CTY 13 and CTY 14 due to the lack of existing boundaries to assist integration, reliance on new landscaping, the requirement for retaining structures arising from excavation works, and the resulting prominence of the dwellings within the landscape.

Mrs Ferguson concluded that the site was incapable of accommodating two dwellings without causing undue prominence and harm to rural character and was recommended for refusal for the reasons set out in the Case Officer Report.

Speaking rights:

In Support:

Mr Tumelty spoke in support of the application, noting that case officers had accepted the proposal as an infill opportunity under Policy CTY 8 and therefore accepted that the site was capable of accommodating two dwellings. He stated that the proposal involved cutting the dwellings into the rising ground, similar to the existing dwelling at No. 73, with the remaining landform providing a backdrop to assist integration. He further stated that access arrangements were acceptable and that any required earthworks and landscaping would enable the development to integrate satisfactorily within the site.

Mr Tumelty further argued that the proposed dwellings would not be unduly prominent, that existing vegetation on the site was of limited value and could be replaced through landscaping, and that the proposal complied with Policies CTY 8 and CTY 16.

Following a query from Councillor McAteer, a discussion ensued regarding the refusal reason relating to prominence and the current siting of the existing buildings. Mr Tumelty confirmed that the current dwelling of the applicant, No. 73, was sited higher than the proposal site and that the remaining ground level behind the proposed site would aid integration. Mrs Ferguson confirmed that the Planning Department had taken the slope of the site into account and believed that the new dwelling would not integrate without extensive ground works to allow for this.

Councillor Larkin queried whether the concerns relating to design and integration could have been dealt with at Reserved Matters stage as the application was an outline application, to which Mrs Ferguson acknowledged that the application was an outline application, however during the processing of the application concerns were raised about the steep incline of the site. She confirmed that as per planning policy, extensive cut and fill was not encouraged in sensitive locations.

Following a query from Councillor Larkin, a discussion ensued regarding the refusal reason relating to CTY14. Mr Tumelty noted that the sections provided during the processing of the application were extreme, and may not be necessary as the backdrop remained in situ to screen the proposal and reduce prominence. Mrs Ferguson advised that the proposal failed to comply with CTY14 as the dwellings amounted to localised build up on the site and would not meet the required road frontage development to be considered respectful of the pattern of the area.

Councillor Reilly proposed to overturn the recommendation to an approval, stating that he believed the works would help integrate the proposal and would not result in prominence. This was seconded by Councillor Rice.

The proposal was put to a vote by way of a show of hands and voting was as follows:

FOR:	8
AGAINST:	0
ABSTENTIONS:	0

The proposal was declared carried.

AGREED: **On the proposal of Councillor Reilly, seconded by Councillor Rice, it was agreed to issue an approval in respect of planning application LA07/2024/1097/O contrary to officer recommendation as contained in the Case Officer Report.**

It was also agreed that Planning Officers be delegated authority to impose any relevant conditions.

(4) LA07/2024/0536/O

On agenda as a result of the Call in Process

Location:
Adjacent to 26 Jack's Road, Killeen, BT35 8FX

Proposal:
Proposed rural detached infill dwelling house and detached domestic garage along with additional landscaping and associated site work.

Conclusion and Recommendation from Planning Official:
Refusal

Power-point presentation:
Mrs Loughan presented the application which sought outline planning permission for a detached rural infill dwelling and detached domestic garage adjacent to 26 Jack's Road, Killeen. She noted that no representations had been received and consultees had raised no objections.

Mrs Loughan advised that the site was located within the open countryside and an AONB and had been assessed under PPS 21, noting that whilst officers accepted that Nos. 26 and 28 Jack's Road fronted onto the road, a third building relied upon by the applicant could not be considered as it did not benefit from planning permission or a certificate of lawful use and was not immune from enforcement action. She further noted that a small garden shed associated with No. 26 was not considered a permanent building for the purposes of Policy CTY 8.

Mrs Loughan advised that the frontage did not fulfill the required SCBUF of three or more buildings and that the proposal did not represent a genuine infill opportunity and further noted that the proposed site layout did not fully infill the gap between the existing properties.

Mrs Loughan concluded that the proposal failed to comply with Policies CTY 1, 8 and 14 and was therefore recommended for refusal for the reasons set out in the Case Officer Report.

Speaking rights:

In Support:

Mr Hamill advised that the application related to a small gap site between Nos. 26 and 28 Jack's Road and stated that there were no concerns regarding the size of the site, road safety or the ability of the site to accommodate a dwelling. He noted that consultees had raised no objections and that no third-party representations had been received.

Mr Hamill argued that the key issue was whether an existing outbuilding associated with No. 26 should be regarded as a building for the purposes of Policy CTY 8, stating that the outbuilding was a permanent structure, fixed to a concrete base and connected to services, and therefore met the definition of a building. He referred to Planning Appeals Commission decisions (2021/A0162, 2021/E0013) which, in his view, demonstrated that ancillary buildings could be considered as part of a SCBUF under Policy CTY 8. He argued that when the outbuilding was taken into account, the site formed part of a frontage comprising three buildings and therefore represented a valid infill opportunity.

Mr Hamill stated that the remaining refusal reasons flowed from the conclusion that the outbuilding should not be counted and argued that the proposal complied with the requirements of Policy CTY 8. He requested that Members overturn the officer recommendation and approve the application or, alternatively, defer the application for a site visit.

Following a query from Councillor Rice, Mr Hamill confirmed that the structure in question was used for garden storage, had been in place for 8 years, was used regularly and had been wired and plumbed for usage.

Councillor Rice queried why the Planning Department did not view the structure as a permanent building, to which Ms Loughan referred to the appeal decision 2019/AO105 and advised that treating a small timber garden shed as a building would lower the standard of the policy to a point of ineffectiveness and would not reflect its intended purpose. She noted that larger permanent structures, such as garages, concrete buildings and farm sheds, had previously been accepted as buildings for policy purposes. However, in this instance, officers did not consider the timber shed to be of a sufficient scale or nature to qualify as a building under the policy.

Councillor Rice requested clarification from legal regarding accepting the structure as a building, to which Mr Rooney noted that whether a structure constituted a building was a matter of fact and degree, with relevant considerations including permanence and physical attachment. He advised that the broad definition of a building within planning legislation was intended for the purposes of the Act and should not be regarded as determinative when interpreting policy. He further advised that the term "building" should be given its ordinary dictionary meaning and that Members should consider the specific circumstances of the case, including the nature and permanence of the structure in question. He reminded Members that they should exercise their own judgement in determining whether the structure could reasonably be regarded as a building for the purposes of the policy.

Councillor McAteer queried the shed at No. 28, to which Mrs Loughan confirmed that the Planning Department could not consider it as part of the SCBUF as it did not have planning permission and was therefore not immune from enforcement as it was unauthorised.

Councillor Rice proposed to overturn the recommendation to an approval, stating that he considered the application to be a borderline application with regard to CTY8 requirements, however he agreed with Mr Hamill that the structure appeared permanent with concrete, electric and running water and which all indicated permanence to him. He noted that all other refusal reasons fell away when the structure was considered a building. This was seconded by Councillor Reilly.

The proposal was put to a vote by way of a show of hands and voting was as follows:

FOR:	8
AGAINST:	0
ABSTENTIONS:	0

The proposal was declared carried.

AGREED: **On the proposal of Councillor Rice, seconded by Councillor Reilly, it was agreed to issue an approval in respect of planning application LA07/2024/0536/O contrary to officer recommendation as contained in the Case Officer Report.**

It was also agreed that Planning Officers be delegated authority to impose any relevant conditions.

ITEMS RESTRICTED IN ACCORDANCE WITH PART 1 OF SCHEDULE 6 OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT (NI) 2014

AGREED: **On the proposal of Councillor McAteer, seconded by Councillor Magennis, it was agreed to exclude the public and press from the meeting during discussion on the following matters which related to exempt information by virtue of Paragraph 1 and 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 6 of the Local Government Act (Northern Ireland) 2014 – information relating to any individual and information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the Council holding that information).**

AGREED: **On the proposal of Councillor McAteer, seconded by Councillor Larkin, it was agreed the Committee come out of closed session.**

The Chairperson advised the following had been agreed whilst in closed session

(5) LA07/2021/1437/F

On agenda as a result of the Call in Process

Location:
30m north of No. 38 Ballyveaghbeg Road, Ballymartin

Proposal:
Erection of rural detached dwelling and detached garage, new landscaping and associated site works in compliance with planning policy PPS21-CTY6

Conclusion and Recommendation from Planning Official:
Refusal

Councillor Rice proposed to overturn the recommendation to an approval, stating that he believed that circumstances demonstrated compliance with CTY6. This was seconded by Councillor Reilly.

The proposal was put to a vote by way of a show of hands and voting was as follows:

FOR:	8
AGAINST:	0
ABSTENTIONS:	0

The proposal was declared carried.

AGREED: **On the proposal of Councillor Rice, seconded by Councillor Reilly, it was agreed to issue an approval in respect of planning application LA07/2021/1437/F contrary to officer recommendation as contained in the Case Officer Report.**

It was also agreed that Planning Officers be delegated authority to impose any relevant conditions.

FOR DISCUSSION / DECISION

P/078/2026: **LDP DRAFT PLAN STRATEGY – FOCUSED CHANGES CONSULTATION**

Read: Report from Mr J McGilly, Assistant Director: Regeneration, presented by Mr M McQuiston, Senior Planning Officer,

regarding LDP Draft Plan Strategy – Focused Changes Consultation. (Copy circulated)

AGREED: **It was agreed on the proposal of Councillor McAteer, seconded by Councillor Larkin, to approve the proposed Focused Changes Consultation Report and associated addendums as set out in appendices A – E of the officer's report along with the arrangements for publication and consultation. As advised, the focused changes are currently subject to legal review. Any major changes as an outcome of that review will be tabled for noting in future.**

P/079/2026: **PLANNING ENFORCEMENT UPDATE**

Read: Report from Mr J McGilly, Assistant Director: Regeneration, regarding Planning Enforcement Update. (Copy circulated)

AGREED: **It was agreed on the proposal of Councillor McAteer, seconded by Councillor Magennis, to note the enforcement update.**

FOR NOTING

P/080/2026: **REVIEW OF THE CLASSES AND THRESHOLDS TO THE SCHEDULE OF THE PLANNING (DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT) REGULATIONS (NI) 2015**

Read: Report from Mrs A McAlarney, Planning Manager, Development Management, regarding Review of the Classes and Thresholds to the Schedule of the Planning (Development Management) Regulations (NI) 2015 (Copy circulated)

AGREED: **It was agreed on the proposal of Councillor Larkin, seconded by Councillor Reilly, to note the response to the DFI Consultation as attached to the officer's report.**

P/081/2026: **HISTORIC ACTION SHEET**

Read: Historic action sheet for agreement (Copy circulated)

AGREED: **It was agreed on the proposal of Councillor Magennis, seconded by Councillor Larkin, to note the historic action sheet.**

There being no further business the meeting ended at 12.24pm.

Signed: _____
Cllr Larkin
Chairperson

Signed: _____
Marie Ward
Chief Executive

NB: 57% of decisions overturned.