

NEWRY MOURNE AND DOWN DISTRICT COUNCIL

Minutes of Planning Committee Meeting of Newry, Mourne and Down District Council held on Wednesday 25 June 2025 at 10am in the Boardroom Council Offices, Monaghan Row, Newry

Chairperson: Councillor M Larkin

**Committee Members in
attendance in Chamber:**

Councillor W Clarke	Councillor C Enright
Councillor G Hanna	Councillor C King
Councillor D McAteer	Councillor D Murphy
Councillor S Murphy	Councillor M Rice

Officials in attendance: Mr J McGilly, Assistant Director: Regeneration
Mr P Rooney – Head of Legal Administration (Acting)
Ms A McAlarney, Development Manager, Planning
Mr A Donaldson, Senior Planning Officer
Mr M Keane, Senior Planning Officer
Miss S Taggart, Democratic Services Manager
Ms F Branagh, Democratic Services Officer
Mr C Smyth, Democratic Services Officer

**Officials in attendance
via Teams:** Mr P Rooney, Development Manager: Planning

P/060/2025: APOLOGIES AND CHAIRPERSON'S REMARKS

Apologies were received from Councillors Feehan, Tinnelly, Quinn and Mrs B Ferguson, Senior Planning Officer.

P/061/2025: DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

An interest was declared by Councillor S Murphy with regard to LA07/2025/0143 and LA07/2025/0144 that were listed on the addendum list.

**P/062/2025: 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 – LA07/2021/0869/F - Councillors Campbell, Enright, Hanna, King, McAteer, and S Murphy attended a site visit on 11 March 2025. The Chairperson noted that as there was not a quorum present at the meeting the application would be heard again.

MINUTES FOR CONFIRMATION

P/063/2025: MINUTES OF PLANNING DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE MEETING WEDNESDAY 28 MAY 2025

Read: Minutes of Planning Committee Meeting held on Wednesday 28 May 2025. **(Copy circulated)**

Councillor McAteer stated that he had attended the above meeting but was not listed among the attendees and requested that this be corrected.

AGREED: **On the proposal of Councillor Hanna, seconded by Councillor D Murphy, it was agreed to adopt the Minutes of the Planning Committee Meeting held on Wednesday 28 May 2025 as a true and accurate record.**

FOR DISCUSSION/DECISION

P/064/2025: ADDENDUM LIST

Read: Addendum List of Planning Applications with no representations received or requests for speaking rights – Wednesday 25 June 2025. **(Copy circulated)**

The Chairperson acknowledged that unforeseen issues could arise and were sometimes unavoidable, however, he emphasised the importance of those requesting speaking rights attending the committee to respond to Members' questions.

AGREED: **On the proposal of Councillor Rice, seconded by Councillor McAteer, it was agreed to defer Item 13 LA07/2023/3412/O to a future Committee Meeting.**

On the proposal of Councillor Rice, seconded by Councillor McAteer, it was agreed to defer Item 15 LA07/2023/3099/O to a future Committee Meeting.

On the proposal of Councillor McAteer, seconded by Councillor Hanna, it was agreed to defer Item 17 LA07/2023/3444/O to a future Committee Meeting.

On the proposal of Councillor Hanna, seconded by Councillor Rice, it was agreed to approve the officer recommendations in respect of the following applications listed on the Addendum List for Wednesday 25 June 2025:

- **LA07/2025/0143** - Unit 3 Greenbank Industrial Estate, Newry, BT34 2QU, (House of Murphy) - Proposed re-construction of commercial premises following fire damage and subsequent demolition

APPROVAL

- **LA07/2025/0144** - Unit 4 Greenbank Industrial Estate, Rampart Road, Newry, BT34 2QU (Formula Karting) - Proposed re-construction of commercial premises following fire damage and subsequent demolition
APPROVAL
- **LA07/2024/0869/F** - Donard Park, Newcastle, Co. Down, BT30 6SR - Erection of New 2 Storey Sports Hub and retention of existing single storey pavilion for ancillary storage (Sports Hub previously approved under LA07/2015/0510/F) (amended description)
APPROVAL
- **LA07/2024/0534/F** - 12 Bridge Street, Newry, BT35 8AE - Change of use from Hairdresser to Dental Surgery with Extension to rear and minor alterations to front elevation
APPROVAL
- **LA07/2023/3100/F** - 101 Main Street, Dundrum, BT33 0LX - proposed retention of existing building fronting main street, to be incorporated in proposed development comprising 2no. commercial units at ground floor level (Main Street) and 4no. 2 bedroom apartments and associated curtilage parking. Proposed demolition of existing building fronting Manse Road.
APPROVAL
- **LA07/2023/2904/F** - 2 Charlotte Street, Warrenpoint, Newry, BT34 3LF - Change of existing building into mixed-use development consisting of 2no, ground floor non-food retail units and 2no. 1st floor residential units, proposed new rear extension consisting of 1no. ground floor non-food retail unit and 1no. 1st floor residential unit
APPROVAL

P/065/2025: PLANNING APPLICATIONS FOR DETERMINATION (WITH PREVIOUS SITE VISITS)

(1) LA07/2021/0869/F

On agenda as a result of the Call-In Process

Location:

NE of 81 Ardglass Road, Ballywooden, Downpatrick

Proposal:

5 No. glamping pods, associated car parking and site works with hard and soft landscaping.

Conclusion and Recommendation from Planning Official:

Refusal

Power-point presentation:

Mrs McAlarney reminded Members of the detail of the application, noting that the application had been previously subject to debate at the Planning Committee Meeting of 5 March 2025. She outlined that the site lay within Bishop Court airfield, and no statutory consultee had

raised any objection, subject to conditions being met, further advising that four third party objections had been received and were detailed within the Case Officer's Report.

Mrs McAlarney advised the Members that the application was considered against PPS21, which directed the Planning Department to the Tourism Policies of TSM6 and 7, confirming that the Planning Department were of the opinion that the proposal did not fully meet the requirements of TSM6 and had therefore been considered against TSM5. She stated that policies CTY13, 14 and 16, relating to rural character and integration were also applicable to the application.

Speaking rights:

In Support:

Mr Tumelty spoke in support of the application, arguing that the application should be recommended for approval as it would be a boost to tourism within the area. He noted that the location was generally regarded as a deprived area and stated that he believed Council should want to support tourism to help boost the economy of the area.

Mr Tumelty put forth his rebuttals for the refusal reasons as stated by the Planning Department, noting that CTY1 included self-catering accommodation as a form of non-residential development that would be accepted within the countryside, that the site was 300m off the public road and would not be visible, the low profile structures of the pods would easily integrate with the surrounding area and that the applicant was willing to engage with the Planning Department in terms of any additional planting they believed would be required to assist with integration.

With regard to Planning Policies, Mr Tumelty stated that he believed that the application should have been considered under TSM5 as self-catering accommodation, not TSM6 and 7 as had been applied. He stated that this application would provide a boost to a deprived area and would assist in providing much needed bed accommodation for the surrounding area.

Councillor Hanna queried the level of proposed planting across the site, noting that the area was a flat open expanse of land with minimal planting on the area.

Mr Tumelty advised that the applicant was willing to take advice on what species would be most suited to the area to assist with integration, taking account of plant survival rates within the open space.

Councillor Hanna further queried the positioning of the pods in relation to the surrounding small soil banks he had observed on site, to which Mr Tumelty confirmed that while the area could be bleak in the winter months, the applicant operated a business that allowed people to come to the area to provide accommodation via the use of the pods. He further noted that since the site visit, there had been mobile homes moved onsite illegally that were being used as holiday lets and the applicant was attempting to follow the rules to ensure any accommodation would help generate a boost to the local economy.

Councillor Larkin requested that the answers remain focused on the questions asked and not raise further issues that were not within the remit of the Planning Committee.

Conclusion and Recommendation from Planning Official:

Refusal

Councillor McAteer requested a deferral for this item.

Agreed: **On the proposal of Councillor McAteer, seconded by Councillor Hanna it was agreed to defer Item LA07/2024/1008/F to a future Committee Meeting.**

(2) LA07/2024/0490/O

On agenda as a result of the call in process

Location:

225m west of 81 Kilbroney Road, Rostrevor

Proposal:

Proposed dwelling on a farm

Conclusion and Recommendation from Planning Official:

Refusal

Power-point presentation:

Mr Keane presented an outline application for a dwelling on a farm off Kilbroney Road, situated in the countryside and within an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) near Rostrevor. The application was recommended for refusal as the proposed siting did not visually link or cluster with the established group of farm buildings located approximately 150–200 metres to the east. He noted that two nearby structures referenced by the agent lacked planning permission, and no justification had been provided on health and safety grounds or in relation to business expansion to support the isolated location.

He advised that the proposed dwelling would have appeared visually isolated from public viewpoints along Kilbroney Road and lacked natural screening and a new access laneway was proposed from Rostrevor Road, despite the existence of an established access. He confirmed that policy discouraged such proposals, and that no planning justification had been submitted for the additional access.

Mr Keane further explained that the site lay within the setting of Kilbroney Church and Graveyard, a Scheduled Monument of regional importance. Historic Environment Division (HED) had advised that the proposal was contrary to the Strategic Planning Policy Statement (SPPS) and Policy BH 1 of PPS 6, as it would significantly harm the integrity of the monument's setting. The site, which included medieval ruins and remains in use, was located within an unspoilt rural landscape, with key public views contributing to its historic and visual significance.

He concluded that although the applicant operated an active and established farm business, the application site was considered fundamentally unacceptable as there were other more appropriate locations that appeared to be available elsewhere on the farm, as indicated on the submitted site location plan. Refusal was recommended on the grounds of inappropriate

siting, unjustified access, and the adverse impact on a regionally important archaeological site.

Speaking rights:

In Support:

Mr Cole advised that the Planning Department had accepted the principle of a dwelling on the applicant's farm stating that the proposed site was visually linked to existing farm buildings, which were well landscaped and visible from key viewpoints. He noted that the policy did not specify a separation distance, and that the proposal met visual linkage requirements. He disputed the case officer's assessment of visibility from Kilbroney Road, presenting images showing the site was screened by vegetation and topography, with visibility limited to the new access point.

On integration, Mr Cole stated that existing screening was sufficient and aligned with Policy CTY 13. He challenged HED's objection regarding Kilbroney Church and Graveyard, presenting images to show no intervisibility due to topography and landscaping, concluding that the proposal was visually linked, integrated into the landscape, and would not impact the Scheduled Monument, thus complying with policy.

Councillor D Murphy noted the site appeared well landscaped and queried whether this had been considered in assessing visual linkage. He also sought clarification on visibility from the road. Mr Keane responded that the site was visible from Kilbroney Road, particularly when approaching Rostrevor, and that the farm buildings were screened, making the site appear isolated. He added that nearby structures lacked permission and were not prominent, and that the proposal relied on planting for integration.

Councillor D Murphy asked if alternative sites had been considered. Mr Cole explained that the applicant lacked permission for a dwelling via the existing laneway, and the proposed site allowed for a new access without removing trees or vegetation, as agreed by statutory bodies.

Mr Sweeney confirmed he had no legal access via the laneway and that DfI Roads had advised additional traffic would constitute intensification. He disagreed with visibility concerns, citing submitted imagery.

Councillor McAteer asked whether HED's objection related to proximity or principle. Mr Keane responded that HED believed the proposal could not be made acceptable with conditions and that no exceptional circumstances had been demonstrated. He confirmed HED considered the development would significantly impact the setting of the church and graveyard.

Councillor Rice noted other dwellings had been approved closer to the church and queried the difference. Mr Keane explained that the referenced development was within the settlement limit and not comparable. He acknowledged a counterargument could be made but emphasised the distinction.

Mr Cole questioned why HED had not objected to a dwelling approved 10 years ago across the road, arguing that policy had not changed and that the proposed site and church could not be viewed together.

information relating to any individual, and the public may, by resolution, be excluded during this item of business.

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

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

RESTRICTED – FOR DECISION

(4) LA07/2024/0207/F

AGREED: On the proposal of Councillor Larkin, seconded by Councillor Hanna, it was agreed to issue an approval in respect of planning application LA07/2024/0207/F, contrary to the officer recommendation as contained in the Case Officer Report.

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

(5) LA07/2024/0891/F

On agenda as a result of the call in process

Location:

Lands approx. 25m north (west) of 52 Tullymacreeve Road, Mullaghbawn, Newry, BT35 9RE

Proposal:

Proposed farm dwelling and detached garage with all associated landscaping and site works

Conclusion and Recommendation from Planning Official:

Refusal

Power-point presentation:

Mr Donaldson advised that no objections were received following neighbour notifications or advertisement. Statutory consultees, including NI Water, DAERA Countryside, and DfI Roads, raised no objections. The site, located in the countryside within the Ring of Gullion AONB, was assessed against relevant planning policy. Following a site inspection, the Planning Department concluded that the proposal failed to meet PPS 21 policies: CTY 1, as there was no overriding reason for development in this rural location; CTY 8, due to its contribution to ribbon development; and CTY 14, as it would result in a suburban-style build-up when viewed alongside existing and approved buildings.

Speaking rights:

In Support:

Mr Hackett spoke in support of the application, arguing that policy—particularly CTY 8—had been applied too strictly. In response to CTY 1, he stated that the applicant's son was

needed on-site to assist with the farm and eventually take over, aligning with PPS 21 and meeting the criteria under CTY 10 for a farm dwelling.

He maintained that the proposal formed a traditional courtyard-style cluster rather than ribbon development, noting that the settlement pattern along Tullymacreeve Road was too sparse and fragmented to qualify as ribbon.

Regarding CTY 14, Mr Hackett argued that the development would not result in suburban-style build-up or harm rural character, as it reflected local patterns of small clusters.

He suggested a site visit to assess enclosure, visual linkage, and settlement pattern, believing it would demonstrate alignment with rural character and the 'Building on Tradition' design guide. He concluded that the proposal was a justified exception under PPS 21 and promoted intergenerational continuity on a working farm.

Councillor D Murphy asked about the traditional development pattern along Tullymacreeve Road. Mr Donaldson described it as irregular, with some ribbon development and other areas more dispersed.

Councillor Larkin noted that using the lane for access would impact the existing farmhouse and was not supported by the report stating that if the lane was avoided, alternative access would be required, though using the lane might still breach CTY 8. Mr Donaldson added that the proposal could still contribute to ribbon development, even without road frontage. Mr Hackett stated that the proposal did not meet the definition of ribbon development, describing the layout as staggered and set back, and more consistent with a cluster.

Councillor Hanna proposed overturning the recommendation for refusal, stating that the application aimed to sustain the farm and that the site formed a cluster rather than ribbon development. He added that any suburban-style build-up could be addressed through planning conditions. The proposal was seconded by Councillor D Murphy.

FOR:	9
AGAINST:	0
ABSTENTIONS:	0

The proposal was declared carried.

AGREED: On the proposal of Councillor Hanna, seconded by Councillor D Murphy, it was agreed to issue an approval in respect of planning application LA07/2024/0891/F contrary to officer recommendation as contained in the Case Officer Report.

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

FOR NOTING

P/067/2025: PLANNING DEPARTMENT UPDATE

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

AGREED: **It was agreed on the proposal of Councillor McAteer, seconded by Councillor D Murphy, to note the contents of the Officer's Report.**

The Chairperson advised that Members were invited to the launch of the NMDDC Local Development Plan Draft Plan Strategy, taking place at the Burrendale Hotel, Newcastle, on Friday 27 June 2025.

P/068/2025: HISTORIC ACTION SHEET

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

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

There being no further business the meeting ended at 12.23pm.

Signed: _____ Chairperson

Signed: _____ Chief Executive

NB: 33% of decisions overturned