

NEWRY MOURNE AND DOWN DISTRICT COUNCIL

Minutes of Planning Committee Meeting of Newry, Mourne and Down District Council held on Wednesday 5 March 2025 at 10am in the Boardroom Council Offices, Monaghan Row, Newry

Chairperson: Councillor D Murphy

**Committee Members in
attendance in Chamber:**

Councillor P Campbell	Councillor C Enright
Councillor G Hanna	Councillor C King
Councillor D McAteer	Councillor S Murphy
Councillor A Quinn	Councillor M Rice
Councillor J Tinnelly	

**Committee Members in
attendance via Teams:**

Councillor M Larkin

Officials in attendance:

Mr C Mallon, Director Economy, Regeneration & Tourism
Mr J McGilly, Assistant Director Regeneration
Ms A McAlarney, Development Manager: Planning
Ms B Ferguson, Senior Planning Officer
Ms M Fitzpatrick, Senior Planning Officer
Mr M Keane, Senior Planning Officer
Ms P Manley, Senior Planning Officer
Mr Peter Rooney, Head of Legal Administration (Acting)
Miss S Taggart, Democratic Services Manager (Acting)
Ms F Branagh, Democratic Services Officer

P/020/2025: APOLOGIES AND CHAIRPERSON'S REMARKS

It was noted that Councillors Quinn and Rice were running late and would be joining the meeting as soon as possible.

The Chairperson noted that item 18 had been deferred to allow for further consideration by the Planning Department.

The Chairperson welcomed representatives Ms Rosemary Daly and Mr Scott Symington from the Department of Infrastructure (DFI) to the meeting to observe proceedings.

P/021/2025: DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

**P/022/2025: DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN ACCORDANCE
WITH PLANNING COMMITTEE PROTOCOL- PARAGRAPH 25**

Declarations of Interest in relation to Para.25 of Planning Committee Operating Protocol – Members to be present for entire item.

Item 6 - Cllrs Campbell, Feehan, Hanna, King, Larkin, McAteer, D Murphy, S Murphy and Tinnelly attended a site visit on 17 February 2025.

Items 7 – Cllrs Campbell, Hanna, McAteer, D Murphy, S Murphy and Tinnelly attended a site visit on 17 February 2025.

MINUTES FOR CONFIRMATION

P/023/2025: MINUTES OF PLANNING DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE MEETING WEDNESDAY 5 FEBRUARY 2025

Read: Minutes of Planning Committee Meeting held on Wednesday 5 February 2025. **(Copy circulated)**

AGREED: On the proposal of Councillor Campbell, seconded by Councillor Hanna, it was agreed to adopt the Minutes of the Planning Committee Meeting held on Wednesday 5 February 2025 as a true and accurate record.

Councillor Quinn joined the meeting during the above discussion – 10.06am

FOR DISCUSSION/DECISION

P/024/2025: ADDENDUM LIST

Read: Addendum List of Planning Applications with no representations received or requests for speaking rights – Wednesday 5 March 2025. **(Copy circulated)**

Councillor Hanna proposed that item 14 - LA07/2023/3476/O be removed from the addendum list and deferred until the next meeting as the agent had been ill and unable to request speaking rights within the required time frame. This was seconded by Councillor Feehan.

AGREED: On the proposal of Councillor Hanna, seconded by Councillor Feehan, it was agreed to defer item 14 LA07/2023/3476/O to the April Planning Committee Meeting.

On the proposal of Councillor McAteer, seconded by Councillor Campbell, it was agreed to approve the officer recommendations in respect of the following applications listed on the Addendum List for Wednesday 5 March 2025:

- **LA07/2021/1089/F** - Lands immediately north of Nos. 36, 38, 64, 66 and 84 Fifth Avenue; west and north west of Nos. 29-35 Third Avenue and east of Craigmore

Way, Newry - Proposed residential development comprising of 44No. dwellings including 16No. detached and 28No. semi-detached units; garages; sunrooms; open space; car parking; landscaping and all associated site and access works.

APPROVAL

- **LA07/2024/1059/F** -Lands to immediate north of 6-16 English Street and immediately south of 1-5 Church Avenue, Downpatrick, - Public realm improvements to include new pavement surfacing, comprising granite paving with natural stone kerbs, new stone walls with timber wall seating; new street lighting and feature lighting columns; relocation of existing heritage lighting columns, new street furniture; retention of the existing fingerpost sign; new decorative planting and trees; and all associated works

APPROVAL

- **LA07/2024/1060/F** - Lands adjacent to 1-71 Church Street, including junction at Church Street/ Saul Way, Downpatrick - Public realm improvements to include new footpath surfacing, comprising granite paving with natural stone kerbs; tactile paving for pedestrian crossings; replacement traffic signals at Saul Way; new asphalt surfacing to vehicle entries; new street furniture planters; new street trees; new street lights; and all associated works

APPROVAL

- **LA07/2023/3256/F** - 105 Harbour Road, Kilkeel, BT34 4AT - Proposed erection of 2no. semi-detached dwellings to replace existing dwelling and associated works

APPROVAL

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT

P/025/2025: **PLANNING APPLICATIONS FOR DETERMINATION (WITH PREVIOUS SITE VISITS)**

(1) **LA07/2023/2514/F**

Previously tabled 5 February 2025.

On agenda as a result of the call-in process.

Location:

26 Station Road, Newry, BT35 8JH

Proposal:

Proposed replacement dwelling with original dwelling retained for ancillary domestic storage, gym and home office

Conclusion and Recommendation from Planning Official:

Refusal

Power point presentation

Ms Fitzpatrick reminded members of the pertinent issues when considering the application, which was a roadside plot that included the dwelling to be replaced and additional lands to

the south of the site, outside the existing curtilage of the dwelling where a portion of the new dwelling was to be located. Given the countryside location, the relevant policies were PPS21 and CTY3. Following a site inspection, the Planning Department was of the opinion that the dwelling did not make an important contribution to the heritage, appearance or character of the area, and the proposal was not sympathetically incorporated into the overall layout.

Mrs Fitzpatrick further advised that there was no visible or physical linkage between the existing and proposed dwelling, with the existing dwelling to be retained in its entirety which would retain the appearance of a dwelling and result in a suburban style build up, contrary to CTY 14. She further advised that the proposed dwelling would have a significant impact greater than the existing dwelling, which was significantly increased again with the retention of the existing dwelling.

Speaking Rights:

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

Mr Fearghal Murray was present to answer any questions Members may have had.

Councillor Larkin queried the information discussed at the previous Committee meeting with regard to the statement made by Mr Murray that the applicant had offered to remove the more modern recent additions to the cottage and had been advised that this may still not change the recommendation to an approval.

Mr Murray advised that the applicant did not want to embark on any amendments that would trigger ecology reports and additional expense if the application would still be recommended for refusal.

Councillor Hanna queried whether an alternative location had been considered for the dwelling as mentioned in the Case Officer's Report, to which Mr Murray advised that he was not aware of a suitable alternative location. He referred to the guidance contained within Building on Tradition, stating that the proposal had been lifted directly from that document. Mrs Fitzpatrick advised that there had been discussions with the agent regarding methods to ensure the proposal was linked to the existing dwelling such as a linked corridor, however this had not been included and therefore the proposal still read as two separate dwellings.

Councillor Campbell queried why the original dwelling was being retained as the original application had been amended from an extension to a replacement dwelling.

Mr Murray advised it was not financially viable to extend the house into a modern home, however the house had been in the family for generations, therefore it had been decided not to knock it down and Building on Tradition stated that there was no requirement to demolish the existing building, that it could be replaced sensitively.

Councillor Larkin proposed to overturn the recommendation to an approval, stating that following the site visit he believed that the application complied with CTY3, the retention of the existing dwelling in situ created a courtyard design that was familiar across the District. He stated that the dwelling not being able to be accommodated within the existing curtilage was explained due to the working farmyard and the inability to place a dwelling here. He advised that he did not believe that the dwelling would be dominant in the area as it would be shielded from view by the existing buildings within the surrounding courtyard, therefore

Councillor Hanna stated that following the site visit, he believed that officers had not made the right recommendation and proposed to overturn the recommendation to an approval as he believed that the design would integrate into the area. In relation to boundaries, he stated that conditions could be applied to the application to ensure it was sympathetic to the area. He further advised that the layout of the dwelling would be different to the neighbouring houses as the plot was of an unusual shape but could also be conditioned to ensure that it fitted with the design of the area.

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

The proposal was declared carried.

Planning Officers be delegated authority to impose any relevant conditions.

P/026/2025: PLANNING APPLICATIONS FOR DETERMINATION

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

Lands immediately west of nos. 1 5 and 7 Forest Hills extending north-westwards to Old Warrenpoint Road and its junctions with Warrenpoint Road and Forest Hills estate road, Newry

Demolition of existing buildings and erection of a residential development consisting of 15 no. apartments (3 no. two storey blocks of 4 no. x 2 no. bedroom apartment and 1no. storey and half block of 3 no. x 2no. bedroom apartments) and all associated site works, with vehicular access from Forest Hills

Conclusion and Recommendation from Planning Official:

Approval

Power-point presentation:

Councillor D Murphy stated that there had been no speaking rights requested in objection to the application and queried if the Committee was content to allow the application to be approved as recommended.

Councillor Hanna proposed to accept the Officer's Recommendations, which was seconded by Councillor S Murphy.

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

FOR:	11
AGAINST:	0
ABSTENTIONS:	0

The proposal was declared carried.

AGREED:

On the proposal of Councillor Hanna, seconded by Councillor S Murphy, it was agreed to issue an approval in respect of planning application LA07/2022/0284/F supporting officer recommendation as contained in the Case Officer Report.

(2)

LA07/2023/3647/F

On agenda as a result of the Call-In Process

Location:

Adjacent to and north of 9 Station Road, Jonesborough BT35 8JH

Proposal:

Detached dwelling and garage under PPS21/CTY 8

Conclusion and Recommendation from Planning Official:

Refusal

Power-point presentation:

Mrs Fitzpatrick outlined the application, highlighting the irregular shaped plot, the proposed narrow section of the side garden and that the site lay outside the settlement limit but within an AONB. She advised that statutory consultations had resulted in no objection, subject to conditions. She reminded Members that CTY8 was a restrictive policy intended to prevent applications that would create or add to a ribbon of development, with the exception clause permitting a maximum of two houses within an otherwise substantially and continuously built-up frontage, provided the proposal respected the local development pattern along the frontage in relation to size, scale, siting and plot size.

Mrs Fitzpatrick advised that while the Planning Department accepted that there was a substantial and continuously built-up frontage, the application was recommended for refusal as the proposal did not respect the size, scale and plot size of the frontages along the

laneway, noting that while not a mathematical exercise, the proposal had a frontage well below the average for the area and was not reflective of the average plot size of the surrounding area.

Mrs Fitzpatrick advised that the application was also contrary to policy CTY14 as it would add to a ribbon of development and result in a suburban style of build up when viewed with existing and proposed buildings along the laneway and was not reflective of the character of the area.

Speaking rights:

In Support:

Mr Barney Dinsmore spoke in support of the application, stating that the Planning Department's concern in relation to the gap size of 64m between 17a and 9 Station Road being insufficient to accommodate two dwellings was unfounded as permission had been granted nearby with a gap size of 48m. He further argued that the frontages and plot sizes of the dwellings within the area were varied, therefore the Planning Department's opinion that the proposal did not reflect the area was inaccurate.

Councillor D Murphy queried why some of the information put forward by the agent had not been taken into consideration by the Planning Department, to which Mrs Fitzpatrick advised that the information presented by the agent noted a number of sites that the Planning Department did not feel appropriate to be considered in assessment of the application. She advised that some of the sites were on the opposite side of the road or did not have frontage onto the lane. She also advised that one of the sites mentioned by the agent did have planning permission but had not been built out therefore there was a gap in the frontage.

Councillor D Murphy then queried whether it was appropriate for the agent to consider the sites he had taken into account when arguing in support of the frontage and plot size given the distance from the proposal site.

Mr Dinsmore stated that it was reasonable to consider 7a, b and c as they were adjacent to the site, and 17 and 17a were included in the overall consideration, he stated that the small number of other dwellings were included as their impact would have been minimal and he believed they should have been considered as part of the character of the area. He felt that for consistency if 7c could be approved, despite not being constructed, then this proposal should also be approved.

Councillor Hanna queried the red line extending into the field behind the proposal, to which Mrs Fitzpatrick advised that the position of the dwelling was not in keeping with the settlement pattern as the frontage was too narrow to house the proposed dwelling.

Councillor Larkin queried if the frontages could be non-linear, staggered and set back from the road when considering an application in relation to CTY8, to which Mrs Fitzpatrick advised that they could be considered if non-linear, but confirmed that the settlement pattern had to be considered, and the proposal would need to mirror the pattern of development of the area.

Councillor Larkin queried why the agent did not increase the red line of the application to include more frontage to make the proposal more acceptable, to which Mr Dinsmore advised that the applicant did not want to squeeze the dwelling at number 9, and that there was an

existing lane between the proposed site and 17a. He also stated that he disagreed with the frontage dimensions as stated by the Planning Department as he believed the proposal had a frontage of 20m, and not 16m as stated.

Councillor Larkin proposed a site visit due to the discrepancy relating to the frontages, which was seconded by Councillor D Murphy.

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

FOR:	11
AGAINST:	0
ABSTENTIONS:	0

The proposal was declared carried.

AGREED: **On the proposal of Councillor Larkin, seconded by Councillor D Murphy, it was agreed to defer planning application LA07/2023/3647/F to allow for a site visit.**

Councillor Rice joined the meeting during above discussion – 10.54

(3) LA07/2023/3221/F

On agenda as a result of the Call-In Process

Location:

Approx 500m SE of 22 Hilltown Road, Fofannyreagh, Hilltown

Proposal:

Replacement of existing turbine as approved under LA07/2015/0378/F with a Vestas V47 Wind Turbine with the same 40m Tower Height and new rotor diameter of 47m and 250Kw output.

Conclusion and Recommendation from Planning Official:

Refusal

Power-point presentation:

Mrs Ferguson outlined the detail of the application, noting that the site was located within the rural area, outside the settlement limit as defined by the Ards and North Down Area Plan (ANDP), and within the Mourne AONB and Countryside Policy area. She confirmed that no objections had been raised following statutory consultations and neighbourhood notifications.

Mrs Ferguson advised that under application LA07/2015/0348/F, the turbine had already been the subject of an increase in rotor diameter of 8m, having a hub situated at 40m, a blade diameter of 31m and a total height to blade tip of 59.5m, while this proposal increased the blade diameter to 47m and an increased total height to blade tip of 63.5m. Planning Policy criteria b of RE1 (PPS18) advised that while unrealistic to conceal wind turbines, steps should be taken to ensure that through good siting and design, landscape and visual impacts were limited and appropriate to the location. She advised that the current site had an overall sensitivity rating of "high" as it was rugged and of high scenic quality.

Mrs Ferguson advised that the Planning Department were of the opinion that the increase in blade length was not proportionate to the existing hub height and would result in closer rotations to the ground and would significantly increase the visual impact along critical views of the turbine structure.

Speaking rights:

In Support:

Mr Thomas Bell spoke in support of the application, supported by Mr Seamus Murray, applicant. Mr Bell utilised a number of images of different viewpoints of the structure from varying distances of 653m to 1.7km, stressing that the visual impact of the proposal was insignificant in the images. He further argued that the proposal should have been considered against the wider economic, environmental and social benefits given that there was a target of 80% renewable energy by 2030 and a net zero target by 2050, and that the increase in output from the proposal should outweigh any concerns of the Planning Department.

Councillor Enright stated that the ANDP made no reference to climate emergency or renewable energy targets and reiterated that no objections had been raised and likened the proposal to similar recent ones in Dundrum. He queried how the Planning Department could make an objective decision on the proposal without taking account of national objectives in relation to climate emergency.

Mrs Ferguson advised that all relevant legislation and targets had been taken into account during the consideration of the proposal, with the recommendation also taking account of the wider environmental and economic considerations and the recommendation for refusal stemmed from the significant visual impact that would outweigh any potential benefits.

Councillor Enright refuted Mrs Ferguson's statement and stated that the case officer report did not consider climate emergency or 100% renewable target by 2050.

Councillor Hanna queried the length of time the turbine had been in situ, and whether any issues had been raised in that time.

Mr Murray confirmed that it had been in place since 2017 with no issues arising and stressed that the turbine was due an upgrade and the proposal was in line with that, alongside the consideration of the national renewable energy target.

Councillor Rice requested clarity on why the proposal was considered to have a significant visual impact, to which Mrs Ferguson noted that a slide show could show the proposal from any direction but failed to consider the critical view points as viewed by the Planning Department. She confirmed that the Planning Department felt that the proposal was considered to be visually prominent in an AONB.

Following a further query from Councillor Rice, Mrs Ferguson confirmed that the Planning Committee were free to make their own assessment, but in the professional opinion of the Planning Department the increase in size was recommended for refusal as it would have a significant visual impact within the area.

Councillor McAteer queried whether there were any guidelines regarding a limit to wind turbine measurements that could be considered aside from the opinion of the Planning

Councillor Feehan queried if there was an upper limit that the Planning Department could approve, to which Mrs McAlarney advised that any proposals were considered on a case-by-case basis, and the surrounding context needed to be taken into consideration, therefore was unable to put an exact figure on an upper limit.

This was seconded by Councillor Hanna, who stated that there were much larger turbines in Kilkeel that was within 350m of a community centre, stressing that this proposal was in the countryside and well away from a road and as such would not have a significant visual impact.

FOR: 10
AGAINST: 1
ABSTENTIONS: 1

AGREED: On the proposal of Councillor Rice, seconded by Councillor Hanna, it was agreed to issue an approval in respect of planning application LA07/2023/3221/F contrary to officer recommendation as contained in the Case Officer Report.

Power-point presentation:

Mrs Manley utilised a power point presentation to highlight the red line of the application, noting that the aerial images showed the context of the open and exposed former airfield and the notable absence of vegetation boundaries. She outlined the proposals, with a pod height of 2.4m in height, covering 18sqm with a wood clad finish and dark red roofing. Utilising further images, she highlighted the site from various viewpoints, all of which noted the open and exposed land with no natural vegetation boundaries.

Mrs Manley advised that no statutory consultees had any objections, and that one objection had been submitted relating to traffic noise and visual impact and had been considered within the case officers report. She noted that the Planning Department were of the opinion that the proposal did not fully meet the requirements of TSM 6.

Speaking rights:

In Support:

Mr Gerry Tumelty spoke in support of the application, supported by Mrs Newman, highlighting that the application had been in progress for a lengthy period. He stressed that he believed that the Planning Department had considered the application against the wrong policy, noting that CTY1 was not relevant as an application relating to tourism should be considered in its own right, and as something that would contribute to the economic growth of the area. He noted that Council had endeavoured to invest in the local area, referencing 4G playing fields that had been installed, stating that the applicant believed that this proposal would assist further with tourism in the area. He stressed that the pods were relatively small and had been placed in what he believed was a private layout utilising the existing tarmac base already on site but noted that the applicant was agreeable to revising this layout as required.

Councillor Hanna queried the frequency of events held at the nearby race track and what safety issues the applicant needed to consider.

Mr Tumelty noted that the official track was operated by the owners a few times a year, but unofficial drag racing took part almost every weekend, with Mrs Newman noting that the official Bishops court track operated only on permitted days, but the unofficial track was utilised 4 – 7 days per week. She highlighted that the proposal was a better use of the space than unofficial drag racing and stressed that the glamping pods were screened from each other, and the proposed vegetation boundaries would further add to that, while also increasing the number of beds available within the area.

Councillor Hanna noted that the official track held meets 16 times per year and queried the relevant impact on tourism, given the level of noise associated with the meets.

Mrs Newman noted that she had spoken to the owners of the official track and stated that they had expressed their hope that their clientele would also use the pods. She stated that they could be used by long distance walkers through the Mourne and by those interested in regenerative farming, which was a unique selling point for the area.

Following a further query from Councillor Hanna regarding the existing buildings on site, Mr Tumelty noted that while a lot of the airfield buildings had been removed, the concrete bases still remained, and this proposal would make use of them in a sensitive and appropriate manner and the remaining structures on site would help screen the pods.

Mrs Manley stated that the recommendation for refusal was not in relation to tourism but was related to integration and the inability of the application to integrate into the landscape given the flat, open and exposed nature of the site.

Mr Tumelty reiterated his opinion that the application should have been considered under TSM 5.

Mrs Manley advised that the layout would have been revisited if the landscape had not been so open and exposed but stated that it would not have been of benefit as the open nature of the site did not lend itself to integration, while Mr Tumelty argued that the 8ft high proposal surrounded by hedging would have minimal impact overall but would help with integration.

Councillor McAteer proposed a site visit, which was seconded by Councillor Campbell.

FOR: 12
AGAINST: 0
ABSTENTIONS: 0

AGREED: On the proposal of Councillor McAteer, seconded by Councillor Campbell, it was agreed to defer planning application LA07/2021/0869/F to allow for a site visit.

(5)

LA07/2023/3316/O

On agenda as a result of the Call-In Process

Location:

50m SE of No. 21 Forkhill Rd, Mullaghbawn, Newry, BT35 9XJ (Site On Upper Rd, Mullaghbawn, Newry, BT35 9XL)

Proposal:

Proposed outline planning application for a replacement dwelling and garage. (Dwelling to be replaced to be retained for storage purposes).

Conclusion and Recommendation from Planning Official:

Refusal

Power-point presentation:

Mrs Fitzpatrick summarised the application, advising that statutory consultations had returned no objections subject to conditions. Utilising images of the site, she outlined the red line boundary which was bound by two laneways, sited above road level and a post and wire fence along the boundaries. She advised that following a site inspection, the Planning Department noted that the subject dwelling exhibited characteristics of a dwelling to be considered under CTY3. It also displayed vernacular characteristics, including a lack of formal plan, rectangular shape, walls of load bearing materials, chimney on the ridge and windows on the front elevation.

Mrs Fitzpatrick noted that CTY3 stated that if a non-listed vernacular dwelling did not make an important contribution to the heritage, appearance or character of the area that permission would be granted for a new dwelling, and the retention of the existing structure would be accepted only if it could be sympathetically incorporated into the overall development. She advised that the application did not conform to policy as the proposed replacement dwelling was off site and as such, it could not be sympathetically incorporated into the overall layout. She advised that it also fell foul of CTY14 as the erection of a new dwelling would create a ribbon of development when viewed with numbers 19, 21, 31 and 31a

Speaking rights:

In Support:

Mr Declan Rooney spoke in support of the application, advising that the replacement dwelling was located off site due to the restricted curtilage of the original dwelling. He argued that the refusal reasons stemmed from the fact that the applicant intended to retain the existing building in situ, further arguing that the dwelling did in fact contribute to the heritage of the area and should be considered compliant with CTY3. He stated that the building was once the home of a blacksmith and a mill owner, who both employed many in the area over a number of years.

Mr Rooney stated that the proposal did incorporate sympathetically into the area as the proposed building would not appear as a stand-alone development, would be visually subordinate to existing buildings and would therefore not detract from the rural character of the area and could be conditioned to ensure its sympathetic integration.

Councillor Campbell queried what weight the Planning Department had given to the heritage of the building when considering the application, to which Mrs Fitzpatrick advised that the Planning Department accepted that the non-listed vernacular dwelling did not make an important contribution to the heritage of the area in line with policy. She advised that if the applicant wished to have the heritage considered, they would have to demonstrate that the existing dwelling could not be made structurally sound.

Councillor D Murphy queried the age of the building, to which Mr Rooney noted that the exact date was unknown, but PRONI maps annotated early 1900s.

Councillor Larkin queried the refusal reason relating to ribbon development, querying how this was possible given that the site lay between two laneways, one of which was possibly a public road, and if the site did not have frontage onto Forkhill Road how could it be considered to add to a ribbon of development.

Mrs Fitzpatrick advised that the application had not been considered under CTY8 as an infill, but CTY3 as a replacement dwelling and it noted that a ribbon development did not have to be serviced by either individual access nor a continuous or urban building line, but buildings sited back, staggered or at angles with gaps between them could still represent ribbon development if they had a common frontage or were visually linked, which was the position of the Planning Department.

Councillor Larkin proposed a site visit to see the dwelling on site to consider any potential ribbon development. This was seconded by Councillor Quinn.

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

FOR:	12
AGAINST:	0
ABSTENTIONS:	0

The proposal was declared carried.

AGREED: **On the proposal of Councillor Larkin, seconded by Councillor Quinn, it was agreed to defer planning application LA07/2023/3316/O to allow for a site visit.**

(6) LA07/2023/3277/F

On agenda as a result of the Call-In Process

Location:

285m N of 40 Ballyhornan Road, Downpatrick, Co. Down BT30 6RH

Proposal:

Farm dwelling & attached carport

Conclusion and Recommendation from Planning Official:

Refusal

The Chairperson noted that this application had been deferred to allow for further consideration by the Planning Department.

FOR DISCUSSION / DECISION

P/027/2025: SLA – REGIONAL PROPERTY CERTIFICATE UNIT

Read Report from Mr J McGilly, Assistant Director Regeneration, regarding SLA – Regional Property Certificate Unit.

Mr McGilly noted that the current arrangement with Fermanagh and Omagh District Council to provide property certificates for all Councils was due for renewal and the report was to request approval to continue with this arrangement.

AGREED: **On the proposal of Councillor D Murphy, seconded by Councillor Hanna, it was agreed to extend the current SLA with the Regional property Certificate Unit (RPCU) for a further 3 years from 1 January 2025 – 31 December 2027.**

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

Agreed: **On the proposal of Councillor Hanna, seconded by Councillor Rice, it was agreed to exclude the public and press from the meeting during discussion on the following items, which related to exempt information by virtue of para. Three of Part 1 of Schedule 6 of the Local Government (Northern Ireland) 2014 – Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the Council holding that information) and the public may, by resolution, be excluded during this item of business.**

Agreed: **On the proposal of Councillor S Murphy, seconded by Councillor Rice, it was agreed the Committee come out of closed session.**

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

RESTRICTED – FOR NOTING

P/028/2025: LOCAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN – PREPARATION, PUBLICATION AND CONSULTATION ARRANGEMENTS INCLUDING SPECIAL COUNCIL COMMITTEE

Read Report from Mr J McGilly, Assistant Director: Regeneration, regarding Local Development Plan – Preparation, Publication and Consultation Arrangements including Special Council Committee.

AGREED: On the proposal of Councillor Quinn, seconded by Councillor Campbell, it was agreed to note the attached Economic Development policies, and that the drafting of the Newry, Mourne and Down District Council draft Plan Strategy was now complete, and copies of the Strategy documents are to be provided to Members in advance of the Special Committee Meeting scheduled for Monday 31 March for their consideration and comment.

FOR NOTING

P/029/2025: PLANNING DEPARTMENT UPDATE

Read Report from Mr J McGilly, Assistant Director: Regeneration, regarding a Planning Department Update.

AGREED: On the proposal of Councillor McAteer, seconded by Councillor S Murphy, it was agreed to note the contents of the Officer's Report.

P/030/2025: HISTORIC ACTION SHEET

Read: Historic action sheet for agreement (**Copy circulated**)

AGREED: It was agreed on the proposal of Councillor McAteer, seconded by Councillor S Murphy, to note the historic action sheet.

There being no further business the meeting ended at 12.37pm

Signed: _____ Chairperson

Signed: _____ Chief Executive

NB: 37.5% of decisions overturned