

NEWRY MOURNE AND DOWN DISTRICT COUNCIL

Minutes of Planning Committee Meeting of Newry, Mourne and Down District Council held on Wednesday 15 October 2025 at 10am in the Council Chamber, Downshire Civic Centre, Downpatrick.

Chairperson: Councillor M Larkin

Committee Members in attendance in Chamber:

Councillor W Clarke	Councillor L Devlin
Councillor C Enright	Councillor G Hanna
Councillor D McAteer	Councillor D Murphy
Councillor S Murphy	Councillor A Quinn
Councillor M Rice	

Committee Members in attendance on Teams:

Councillor J Tinnelly

Officials in attendance:

Mr C Mallon, Director of Economy, Regeneration & Tourism
Mr J McGilly, Assistant Director: Regeneration
Ms A McAlarney, Development Manager – Planning
Mrs B Ferguson, Senior Planning Officer
Mr M Keane, Senior Planning Officer
Mr P Rooney, Head of Legal Administration
Ms S Taggart, Democratic Services Manager
Ms F Branagh, Democratic Services Officer
Mr C Smyth, Democratic Services Officer

P/090/2025: APOLOGIES AND CHAIRPERSON'S REMARKS

An apology was received from Councillor C King.

P/102/2025: DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

P/103/2025: 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 & 7 - Cllrs Clarke, Hanna, Larkin, McAteer, Quinn & Rice attended a site visit on 17 September 2025

MINUTES FOR CONFIRMATION

P/104/2025: MINUTES OF PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING OF WEDNESDAY 17 SEPTEMBER 2025

Read: Minutes of Planning Committee Meeting of Wednesday 17 September 2025. **(Copy circulated)**

AGREED: **On the proposal of Councillor Hanna, seconded by Councillor McAteer, it was agreed to adopt the Minutes of the Planning Committee Meeting of Wednesday 17 September 2025 as a true and accurate record.**

FOR DISCUSSION/DECISION

P/105/2025: ADDENDUM LIST

Read: Addendum List of Planning Applications with no representations received or requests for speaking rights – Wednesday 15 October 2025. **(Copy circulated)**

Councillor Hanna proposed to defer item 24 – LA07/2024/1570/O to a future Committee meeting as the agent had missed the deadline for request of speaking rights due to family illness. This was seconded by Councillor Enright.

AGREED: **On the proposal of Councillor Hanna, seconded by Councillor Enright, it was agreed to defer item 24 – LA07/2024/1570/O to a future Committee Meeting.**

On the proposal of Councillor McAteer, seconded by Councillor Hanna, it was agreed to approve the officer recommendations in respect of the following applications listed on the Addendum List for Wednesday 15 October 2025:

- **LA07/2025/0600/F** - Unit 14 & 14A Grove Shopping Centre 77 Market Street Downpatrick BT30 6LP - Alterations to existing shop units including changes to shopfronts, and change of use for the sale of hot and cold food and drink for consumption both on and off the premises (sui generis), and for the retail sale of bakery products, snacks etc
APPROVAL
- **LA07/2024/0227/RM** - Immediately adjacent to and North of 32 Bettys Hill Road, Ballyholland, Newry, BT34 2NB-Two Storey Dwelling
APPROVAL
- **LA07/2024/1272/F** - 1-2 Newry Street, Warrenpoint, BT34 3JZ - Proposed change of use from ground floor shop units to office space and bar/restaurant/takeaway
APPROVAL

- **LA07/2022/1602/F** - To the rear and immediately North East of 7-8 Queen Street, Warrenpoint - Proposed 4 no. 3 bedroom terraced dwellings with in-curtilage parking with vehicular access onto Queen Street

APPROVAL

- **LA07/2024/0724/F** - 38 Merrion Avenue, Newcastle, BT33 0BJ - Proposed Front Porch Extension, Rear / Side Extension & Repositioned Vehicular Access.

REFUSAL

P/106/2025: PLANNING APPLICATIONS FOR DETERMINATION (WITH PREVIOUS SITE VISITS)

(1) LA07/2024/1077/O

On agenda as a result of the Call-In Process.
Previously tabled 20 August 2025.

Location:

Land 25m west of No 60 Crawfordstown Road, Ballynahinch

Proposal:

2 x Infill dwellings

Conclusion and Recommendation from Planning Official:

Refusal

PowerPoint Presentation:

Mrs. Ferguson advised that the site had been assessed against Policies CTY 1, 8, 13, 14 and 16, along with retained Policies NH2, NH5 and AMP2. She explained that, in considering whether a substantial and continuously built-up frontage existed in accordance with Policy CTY 8, it was noted that Nos. 76 and 76A were deemed not to benefit from road frontage as they were separated from the laneway by defined curtilages and boundary walls. Similarly, No. 60A, located on the opposite side of the laneway, was also discounted for the same reason. Consequently, only No. 60 was considered to have frontage to the road, and the proposal therefore failed to satisfy the first test of Policy CTY 8.

Mrs. Ferguson further reported that part of the area shown within the indicative site layout did not form part of the actual application site, effectively reducing its overall size. It was confirmed that the proposed plot sizes were not in keeping with the established pattern of development in the locality, where existing dwellings were characterised by large curtilages, spacious gardens, and generous parking provision.

She concluded that the proposal was considered to be contrary to Policies CTY 1, 8, 13 and 14, as it would create a ribbon form of development along the laneway, resulting in a detrimental impact on the rural character of the area.

Speaking rights:

Cllrs Clarke, Hanna, Larkin, McAteer, Quinn & Rice attended a site visit on 17 September 2025.

55m east of 29 Clonvaraghan Road, Castlewellan, BT31 9JU

Proposal:

Proposed replacement dwelling (with retention of original dwelling for storage purposes) and all associated site works

Conclusion and Recommendation from Planning Official:

Refusal

Power-point presentation:

Mrs Ferguson reminded Members that the application that consisted of a detached single-storey gate lodge, historically linked to Ballywillwill House, as annotated on historic maps. She advised that following consultation with Historic Environment Division (HED), it was confirmed that the gate lodge was a curtilage structure associated with the listed Ballywillwill House and therefore received the same legal protection under Section 80(7) of the Planning Act (NI) 2011.

Mrs Ferguson confirmed that as no exceptional circumstances had been demonstrated, the retention of the original dwelling for storage did not meet this threshold, and no evidence had been provided to support claims that renovation or extension was unviable. She confirmed that while HED had no objections to the proposal, their remit was to consider the impact on the listed building and took no account of other planning policies that were the remit of the Planning Department. She confirmed that the new dwelling was proposed outside the historical curtilage, within an open field, and lacked justification regarding why the existing curtilage could not accommodate a modest-sized replacement. She concluded that the proposal failed to meet the requirements of Policies CTY1, 3, 13, 14, and 15, as well as Policy NH6 of PPS 2.

Mrs Ferguson noted that as the application was for the retention of a listed building for storage purposes, it followed that any proposed works must be accompanied by listed building application in association with HED.

Speaking rights:

Cllrs Clarke, Hanna, Larkin, McAteer, Quinn & Rice attended a site visit on 17 September 2025.

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

Mr Declan Rooney was present to answer any questions Members may have had.

Councillor Hanna expressed concern that the Planning Department had made a detailed presentation while the applicant had no opportunity to address the Committee. He queried whether the building in question was listed or merely within the curtilage of Ballywillwill House.

Mrs McAlarney confirmed that the building was listed, as advised by HED, and explained that Planning Policy permitted replacement of a listed building only in exceptional circumstances, which the applicant had not yet demonstrated.

Mr Declan Rooney contended that the original case officer had confirmed the building was not listed, but HED later considered it listed due to its curtilage. He noted that the building

proposed for retention was approximately 450m from Ballywillwill House's curtilage. He also stated that the applicant felt they had submitted evidence demonstrating exceptional circumstances, including retaining the building in good condition rather than allowing it to deteriorate.

Mrs McAlarney reiterated the Planning Department's objection, emphasising that HED was a statutory consultee and had stated that the gate lodge should be treated as a listed building. She noted that exceptional circumstances were required for replacement and that alternative options, such as amending the current structure, were available.

Councillor Clarke expressed concern that current policy did not encourage restoration of listed buildings and queried why refusal was recommended when HED had no objection.

Mrs Ferguson noted that while policies support restoration or alteration, CTY3 prohibited replacement except in exceptional circumstances.

Councillor Clarke argued that the proposal retained the building in situ rather than resulting in its loss.

Councillor McAteer accepted the Planning Department's recommendation but queried HED's support for retaining the gate lodge and whether exceptional circumstances could be considered satisfied by retaining the building as storage as he interpreted exceptional circumstances as the building being upgraded and retained alongside the new dwelling.

Mrs Ferguson reiterated that exceptional circumstances had not been demonstrated.

Mr Peter Rooney stated that the applicant's reasoning, that the building was listed, was illogical, as the policy itself dealt with listed buildings. He noted that HED's support did not remove the need for compliance with planning policy.

Councillor Rice asked Mr Declan Rooney to clarify what exceptional circumstances were presented, to which he highlighted retention of the building, constraints from a NI Water pipe, potential bat habitats, and that substantial alterations would undermine the building's listed status. He argued that preserving the building as storage would enhance it and allow the proposed dwelling to proceed without impacting the listed building.

Mrs McAlarney noted that the Planning Department had no evidence of proposed enhancements, and that any such works would require a listed building consent application, which had not been submitted.

Councillor McAteer asked whether the listed building could be incorporated into the new dwelling design, to which Mr Declan Rooney confirmed that a conservation architect had been appointed to address this at the reserved matters stage.

Councillor Clarke asked whether the Committee could request the listed building application to review the proposed design, to which Councillor Larkin clarified that as this was an outline application, design matters would be considered at reserved matters stage.

Mrs McAlarney confirmed that without a listed building application, the Planning Department could not approve the proposal.

Councillor Clarke proposed deferring the application to allow the listed building consent application to be submitted and considered. This was seconded by Councillor Hanna.

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 Clarke, seconded by Councillor Hanna, it was agreed defer planning application LA07/2023/2230/O to allow for the submission and consideration of a Listed Building Consent application.**

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT

P/107/2025: PLANNING APPLICATIONS FOR DETERMINATION

(1) LA07/2023/3622/F

On agenda as a result of the Call-In Process
Previously tabled on 20 August 2025

Location:

Vacant site between No.39 Church Street and No.2 Water Street, Rostrevor

Proposal:

Proposed barbers/hairdressers

Conclusion and Recommendation from Planning Official:

Refusal

Power-point presentation:

Mr Keane presented the application, which sought full permission for the construction of a new building to accommodate a barbers and hairdressers, including a barber's area, store, W/C, and staff facilities. He confirmed that the site was located within the settlement limit of Rostrevor, inside the boundary of the Conservation Area and an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB), comprising a small vacant plot that had recently been cleared. Mr Keane reminded members that a previous application for an identical proposal on the same site, featuring the same design, had been refused, noting that the current application was effectively a repeat submission.

Mr Keane confirmed that proposals within the Conservation Area were required to preserve or enhance its character, and that there was a presumption against development that failed to do so. He confirmed that it was the opinion of the Planning Department that the proposed building would neither preserve nor enhance the character of the Conservation Area and would have a detrimental impact on adjacent residential properties, and that the Planning Department's position had remained unchanged from the previous refusal.

In relation to residential amenity, Mr Keane advised that the site adjoined Nos. 2 and 4 Water Street, both two-storey residential properties with rear returns. It was considered that the proposed development would have a dominant and overbearing impact on the adjoining dwellings, particularly affecting their rear yard areas and returns due to the proximity of the proposed building, which would also give rise to overlooking concerns.

Speaking rights:

In Support:

Mr John Cole spoke in support of the application, noting that the site had previously accommodated a building, and the proposal aimed to restore the streetscape by replicating the original structure in terms of scale, form, materials, and detailing. He emphasised that the development would enhance the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, replacing an overgrown and neglected site, and would conform to the guidance set out in the Rostrevor Conservation Area document. He stated that the proposal was sympathetic to the surrounding built form, would not cause environmental problems, and would not result in overlooking of neighbouring properties. He also noted that similar single-storey buildings existed alongside two-storey structures in the area, and that a comparable proposal had previously been approved on the site. He concluded that the proposal would restore the site to its historic condition, improve the street scene, and provide local employment.

Following a query from Councillor Rice, Mr Keane advised that the proposal was not in keeping with the character of the area due to a number of issues, those being the narrow width of the site, the overall form design and appearance of the proposal being incongruous with the area and the proposal would occupy the entire width of the site.

Mr Cole stated that the proposal was exactly as was on site previously, despite the tight site, arguing that it would enhance the area as the site had become overgrown and was used for illegal fly tipping.

Councillor Rice queried what the possible adverse impacts on the neighbouring properties would be, given the usual opening hours of a barbers would be less than that of the neighbouring restaurant.

Mr Keane confirmed that while there historically was a building on the site some time ago, a whole suite of Planning Policies had been introduced since then. He noted that residential amenity would be impacted given there was approximately 2m from gable to gable of the residential properties, and the potential of overlooking from the proposal into the ground floor windows of the residential dwellings.

Councillor Rice stated that the neighbours had not objected to the proposal, while Mr Keane confirmed that the Planning Department still had to consider any potential impact on residential amenity, regardless of objections raised.

Mr Cole stated that the usual opening hours of a barbers had less of an impact on the area than the longer opening hours of the nearby restaurant, which he argued would also cause overlooking and that the amenity space of the residential dwellings was not impacted as there were nearby parks and green spaces available for residents within the area.

Following a query from Councillor D Murphy regarding the character of the area, Mr Keane confirmed that while there was a degree of variation in the local buildings, the Planning

Department still had concerns regarding the impact of the proposal with regard to dominance and overlooking.

Councillor Devlin queried the representations received and why they were noted, not as objections, but as concerns, and what potential impact the proposal would have on No. 6 Water Street.

Mr Keane confirmed that the representations received were classed by the Planning Department depending on the content, and those received were in relation to parking within the town, were considered as somewhat neutral, and therefore classed as concerns rather than objections. He also confirmed that the primary concerns related to the impact on the residential amenity of No. 2 and 4.

Councillor Enright queried the recommendation for refusal as the application replaced the street scape of previous years, noting that the proposal should enhance the conservation area, yet seemed to offend modern planning policies. He queried whether there was a way forward that would be agreeable to the area and to the Planning Department.

Mr Keane confirmed that in accordance with PPS6, new proposals must preserve and enhance the conservation area, and while the Planning Department were not opposed to a modern proposal within the site, the current proposed design was not acceptable.

Councillor Tinnelly requested further information with regard to any amendments that had been made since the previous refusal recommendation, to which Mr Cole stated that there had been numerous discussions with the Planning Department and a number of amendments discussed but ultimately an agreement had not been reached.

Councillor Tinnelly noted the agent's efforts to design an acceptable proposal and queried if the Planning Department had offered any input as to what would be acceptable on site, noting that the current state of the site also did not enhance the area for visitors.

Mr Keane reminded Members that the role of the Planning Department was to assess what was tabled as part of an application. He noted that the previous application had been deferred to allow for further consultation with the Planning Department, with several revisions being submitted that were all ultimately unacceptable in terms of policy.

Councillor Tinnelly queried whether a condition could be placed on the application to ensure that it was solely retained as a commercial premises, to which Mr Keane confirmed that the use of the building was not a primary concern of the Planning Department, but rather that the proposal failed a number of planning policies as already outlined.

Councillor Rice proposed to overturn the recommendation to an approval, stating that he believed the building did resemble the local architecture, would be sympathetic to the area, that the removal of the vacant site would be of benefit to the area and that there would be no detriment to the nearby amenities, therefore paragraphs 6.18 and 6.19 of SPPS were satisfied, and all other refusal reasons would fall.

This was seconded by Councillor D Murphy, who stated that he believed the refusal recommendation had been a harsh interpretation of policy, that the proposal would match the character of the area, would not have a negative impact on the conservation area and that PED 9 should be set aside given the fact that the proposal would enhance the area.

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

FOR:	9
AGAINST:	2
ABSTENTIONS:	0

The proposal was declared carried.

AGREED: **On the proposal of Councillor Rice, seconded by Councillor D Murphy, it was agreed to issue an approval in respect of planning application LA07/2023/3622/F contrary to officer recommendation as contained in the Case Officer Report.**

The Chairperson advised that items 13 (LA07/2023/3099/O) and 13 (LA07/2023/3412/O) would be heard together.

(2) LA07/2023/3099/O and LA07/2023/3412/O

On agenda as a result of the Call-In Process

Location:

Directly opposite No. 32 and 32A Newtown Road, Rostrevor, Newry, Co. Down, BT34 3BZ
Directly opposite No. 32A and adjoining 33A and 33B Newtown Road, Rostrevor, BT34 3BZ

Proposal:

New dwelling with detached garage on gap/infill site.
New dwelling with detached garage on gap/infill site

Conclusion and Recommendation from Planning Official:

Refusal

The Chairperson stated that the applicant had been unable to attend due to a medical emergency and requested that the items be deferred to a future Committee.

AGREED: **On the proposal of Councillor D Murphy, seconded by Councillor Clarke, it was agreed to defer planning applications LA07/2023/3099/O and LA07/2023/3412/O to a future Committee Meeting.**

(3) LA07/2024/0295/F

On agenda as a result of the Call-In Process

Location:

Adjacent to and directly SE of 16 Derryoge Road, Newry, BT34 4JR

Proposal:

Proposed change of house type and re-siting of a dwelling on a farm originally approved under permission LA07/2020/0265/F

Conclusion and Recommendation from Planning Official:

Refusal

Power-point presentation:

Mr Keane outlined the application, noting that the proposal was for a change of house type alongside the re-siting of an already approved farm dwelling. He stated that the relevant policies as contained with the SPPS were CTY 1, 8 and 14, PPS 2, 3 and 21, alongside DCAN 15 and the Banbridge, Newry and Mourne Area Plan 2015.

Mr Keane confirmed that the reasons for refusal were related to the revised siting of the farm dwelling, which would result in ribbon development and a suburban style build up when viewed with existing buildings, while the previously approved location did not have this impact.

Speaking rights:

In Support:

Mr Lynam explained that the applicants had requested a simpler, more affordable dwelling than the extant permission, which was for a complex two-storey farmhouse. On examining the site, he noted that the terrain was flat and sandy, with a filled pit to the rear of the farm buildings, which raised concerns about potential ground instability. He stated that structural issues were observed in an adjoining agricultural building, and a civil engineer had recommended relocating the proposed dwelling at least 35 metres from the rear boundary to mitigate the risk of ground slip.

Mr Lynam stated that the revised proposal utilised the existing farm entrance and access laneway, with the new dwelling positioned close to the existing farmhouse. The design was modest in height and scale, consistent with surrounding single-storey farm buildings, and no further dwellings could be accommodated under CTY 8 infill provisions. He argued that the proposed layout constituted an acceptable farm cluster rather than creating ribbon development and stated that the structural safety requirements justified an exception to Policy CTY 8 and that the proposal should be approved to allow the applicants to develop a safe domestic dwelling on an active farm.

Councillor Devlin queried whether any supporting evidence of the mentioned ground instability and resulting structural issues had been submitted by the applicant, to which Mr Keane confirmed that the agent had referenced the slippage in their Design Access Statement, and later referenced a structural engineer report, however nothing had been received by the Planning Department. He confirmed that the onus was on the application to provide the required information, and that the Planning Department's decision was based on all the evidence and information that had been provided.

Mr Lynam stated that there had been a report prepared in January 2024, and he believed that the Planning Department should have had sight of this, to which Mr Keane confirmed that the Department had conducted a thorough search of all paperwork received, and confirmed that there was correspondence dated January 2025, not 2024, which stated that a report would be submitted in due course, but had not been received to date.

Mr Lynam stated that he had an email from the planning officer in response to his query regarding outstanding items confirming that he would get in touch should there be any outstanding items, and that there had been no further contact since February 2025.

Mr Keane stated that the Planning Department had sufficient information to determine the application, which had been submitted in February 2024 and recommended for refusal in June 2025. He stated that the applicant had some 15 months to submit any supporting evidence relating to ground conditions, and the Planning Department had made a recommendation based on all the documents received.

Following the discussion, Councillor Devlin queried whether it was prudent to defer the application to allow for the submission of the structural engineer report for consideration in relation to the exception clause of CTY8.

Mr Lynam stated that he had a qualification in structures, and his statements should be acceptable to the Committee, further referencing images to highlight compliance with CTY8 in relation to frontage which would not result in ribbon development.

Councillor D Murphy noted the correspondence from the Planning Officer that stated they would be in contact should any further information be required, noting that this could be viewed as a disadvantage to the applicant. He queried the refusal reasons in relation to ribbon development or whether the applicant's view of the proposal as a cluster development was more relevant, and whether there would be a future opportunity for an infill development should this application be approved.

Mr Keane reiterated that the agent had referred to supporting reports, but these had not been submitted and that the Planning Department had sufficient information to determine the application. He confirmed that the refusal reasons were not based on what may result from the development but rather was a classic case of ribbon development.

Councillor Hanna queried why the proposal had not been submitted under CTY10 as an active farm dwelling, to which Mr Lynam noted that the applicant was trying to move the building from the current accepted approved location due to the structural issues that may arise, therefore a change of house type to an already approved planning application was more straightforward.

Councillor Larkin queried why the applicant had not replicated the access arrangements as previously approved and not altered the red line to include the full width of the adjoining field so as to negate the ribbon development argument.

Mr Lynam stated that the access had remained unchanged, following which a discussion ensued regarding the red line boundary. The outcome of which was Mr Lynam stating that the plans had not been altered, and if they had, they were in consideration of health and safety issues in such a small application site and to incorporate some amenity space for the applicants.

Councillor Hanna proposed to overturn the recommendation to an approval, stating that he believed the application was compliant with the exception clause of CTY8 given the potential structural integrity issues, and would cluster with existing buildings. He stated it would also be compliant with CTY14 as it was sustainable development within the countryside and would have no issues with appropriate integration, which could be delegated to officers to

Opposite and adjacent to junction of Lower Knockbarragh Road with Upper Knockbarragh Road, Ballymoney, Rostrevor, Co. Down

Proposal:

Proposed new agricultural shed to shelter existing animal / stock handling facilities for the sole purpose of inspection and treatment of animals.

Conclusion and Recommendation from Planning Official:

Refusal

Power-point presentation:

Mr Keane presented the application, noting that site was located in the countryside within an AONB, where the provisions of PPS 21 applied. He explained that Policy CTY 12 of PPS 21, relating to agricultural development, was the key policy test and that a letter had been issued to the applicant in March that had set out the policy context and the Planning Department's concerns, but no further information had been submitted in response. He confirmed that the Department concluded that the proposal was contrary to points A, B, C and D of Policy CTY 12, as it had not been demonstrated that the building was necessary for the efficient operation of the holding, the scale and isolated roadside siting were considered inappropriate, failing to integrate with the rural landscape and adversely affecting the area's natural heritage. He further noted that no evidence had been provided to show that suitable existing buildings were unavailable, and that the proposed shed was not sited adjacent to existing farm structures.

Mr Keane noted that there was an active application for a new dwelling on the holding that would result in the removal of several existing buildings, further undermining the justification for a new structure. He confirmed that the application was recommended for refusal as being contrary to Policies CTY 12 (a–d), CTY 13 (a–c), CTY 14 (a) and NH 6 of PPS 2.

Speaking rights:

In Support:

Mr O'Callaghan stated that the proposal sought only to roof an existing animal handling and isolation pen rather than construct a new building. He explained that the facility was essential for isolating and treating livestock away from the main herd and that the roof would provide necessary shelter for both animals and farm workers. He argued that the location, slightly removed from the main farm, was appropriate given the pen's function and that the modest, low-profile structure would integrate well with the landscape. He also noted that a similar development could be carried out nearby without requiring planning permission and therefore urged Members to apply pragmatic judgement and approve the proposal.

Councillor Enright joined the meeting at this stage – 12.17pm

Councillor Rice queried the current facilities in use for isolating and treating animals, to which Mr O'Callaghan noted that there were facilities near the farm yard that were used, however as some had been earmarked for demolition to allow for a new farm dwelling, it was more important than ever to facilitate isolation further from the farm dwellings.

Councillor Rice then queried why the shed offended planning policy and whether it was solely down to clustering with existing farm buildings.

Mr Keane confirmed that as per the Case Officer Report and his earlier presentation, the application was contrary to CTY12 A, B, C and D in that it had not been evidenced as necessary in its proposed location, the inappropriate scale, lack of integration, adverse impact on the area and had not been sited adjacent to existing farm buildings.

Councillor Rice queried whether the Planning Department accepted that, regardless of essential or necessary, that the farm dwelling required an isolation area for sick or injured animals.

Mr Keane confirmed that the existing farm holding had a number of buildings which negated the need for a further building, that the pen and fields also counted towards isolation areas as per Planning Policy. He queried the need for the proposal when a number of buildings had been marked for demolition to allow for a farm dwelling and queried the need for the proposed farm dwelling at the proposed site when the applicant could site the farm dwelling elsewhere and retain the current agricultural buildings.

Mr O'Callaghan stated that the existing fields and pen did not provide shelter, and that the proposed location was best practice away from the main farm dwellings.

Following a query from Councillor McAteer, Mr O'Callaghan stated that the proposed application had a larger footprint than those buildings which were to be demolished.

In response to a query from Councillor Hanna regarding why the Planning Department believed that the application did not integrate as there was tree coverage within the proposed siting, Mr Keane advised that the existing pen was sheltered behind a hedge, but the proposed pen was 4m high, along the roadside and would be unduly prominent. He reiterated that fields and existing pens provided adequate isolation areas.

Councillor Tinnelly queried whether the application would be recommended for approval if sited within 75m of the farm buildings, to which Mr Keane reiterated that the Planning Department could only consider what had been submitted as part of the application.

Councillor Rice proposed a site visit, which was seconded by Councillor Hanna.

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

FOR:	10
AGAINST:	0
ABSTENTIONS:	0

The proposal was declared carried.

AGREED: **On the proposal of Councillor Rice, seconded by Councillor Hanna, it was agreed to defer planning application LA07/2024/0401/F to allow for a site visit.**

As Cllr Enright was absent for the presentations, he was unable to cast a vote.

(5) LA07/2024/1403/F

On agenda as a result of the Call-In Process

Location:

170m south of 4 Curley Road, Newry, BT34 1NU

Proposal:

Replacement of existing dwelling with new dwelling within existing site curtilage

Conclusion and Recommendation from Planning Official:

Refusal

Power-point presentation:

Mr Keane outlined the application as located in the countryside, noting that the application was recommended for refusal as no principle for development had been established. He explained that the structure on site comprised the remains of a former building which had partially collapsed. The structure, positioned gable-end to the road, measured approximately 7 metres by 4 metres, with two door openings to the front and no visible window openings, and that the eastern gable peak had collapsed, meaning the building was not intact.

Mr Keane concluded that the remains failed to meet the minimum requirements for a replacement dwelling under Policy CTY 3, as not all external walls were substantially intact.

Speaking rights:

In Support:

Mr Gerry Tumelty spoke in support of the application, supported by Mr Moffett Jr and Snr. He explained that the site contained the remains of a former dwelling that had been damaged during a storm in 2021 when a fallen tree struck an attached outbuilding and the roof of the main structure. The applicant had subsequently cleared the fallen trees and debris, exposing the original stone building, which sat gable-end to the road and partially into a slope at the rear. He stated that the structure retained four external walls, with damage limited to the roof and part of the rear wall, and that the applicant had not altered the integrity of the building. He argued that the proposal met the policy tests for a replacement dwelling under PPS 21 Policy CTY 3, as all structural walls were substantially intact, even if parts appeared obscured by retained ground.

Councillor D Murphy queried whether the building had previously been a dwelling, and requested clarification on the definition of substantial within the policy.

Mr Keane confirmed that the building did have the remains of internal characteristics of a dwelling. He noted that the definition of substantial was not definitive but was taken on a case-by-case basis and as shown within the images contained within the Case Officer Report, that all 4 external walls were not substantially intact.

Councillor Devlin noted that the images used by the Planning Department and those historical images evidenced by the applicant and queried whether any legal independent evidence was available to confirm that the building had previously been a dwelling, further noting that the storm damage should not be a disadvantage to the applicant.

Resume – 1.37pm

(6) LA07/2024/1386/F

On agenda as a result of the Call-In Process

Location:

Approximately 150m NE of No.15 Clontafleece Road, Warrenpoint, Newry BT34 3QS.

Proposal:

4 No. glamping pods & associated site works

Conclusion and Recommendation from Planning Official:

Refusal

Power-point presentation:

Mr Keane outlined the application, which was sited in the countryside within an AONB, which directed the Department to processing the application against the tourism policies of PPS16 and PPS2. He explained that the proposal related to a roadside field where the land rose above the road, with plans including a row of ten parking spaces, four plots for the pods, and a central communal area. The site levels indicated that the pods would sit approximately three to five metres higher than the road, and the agent's claim that they were below road level was deemed inaccurate.

Mr Keane stated that, given the elevated and exposed nature of the site, the size and design of the pods, the formal layout, and the reliance on new planting for integration, the development could not be absorbed into the landscape without adverse impact on the AONB setting. He added that the proposal's proximity to a replacement dwelling currently under construction would result in a build-up of development and contribute to ribboning, thereby harming rural character

Mr Keane confirmed that the application was recommended for refusal as it was contrary to CTY1, 8, 13, 14, TSM 6 and 7 and NH6 of PPS2.

Speaking rights:

In Support:

Mr Colin Dalton spoke in support of the application, supported by applicant Ms Catrina Campbell.

Mr Dalton was noted that there were no objections from statutory consultees, no local opposition, and ten letters of support had been received. He stated that revisions to the scheme were submitted in June 2025 but he believed that the Planning Department had not assessed these revisions and the refusal recommendation was based on superseded drawings. He contended that the updated proposal addressed all concerns previously raised, including height, materials, layout, and landscaping. Updated topographical information demonstrated minimal visual impact, with pods set into the lowest part of the site and screened by mature hedging.

Ms Campbell emphasised that the revised design incorporated natural screening, retention and repair of existing stone walls, and additional native planting, including 1,900 new trees to be planted in partnership with the Woodland Trust. The layout reflected traditional clachan patterns, avoided ribboning, and maintained open space between pod clusters. It was further highlighted that the pods were of modest scale (45m² each), sustainably designed with recessive finishes and solar-readiness, and that the development aligned with the Council's tourism strategy by providing high-quality, family-focused accommodation that supported sustainable rural tourism and local economic benefit. She asserted that all technical and environmental issues had been resolved, that the refusal was based on outdated information, and that the proposal fully complied with policy while enhancing the character of the Mournes AONB.

Councillor D Murphy queried the refusal reasons relating to ribbon development and integration as he believed the pods were located some distance from the road and the images had shown a large hedge that would help with integration.

Mr Keane confirmed that a new dwelling had been built to the left of the pods, all of which had frontage to the road. He also noted that the proposed plans suggested that the hedge be moved back to accommodate the required visibility splays. Given the distance from that roadside to the pods, and the elevation of the site, the pods would effectively be sited higher than the road.

Mr Dalton stated that the pods would not be visible from the road, noting that the pods had been relocated from previous designs to further down the hill to ensure they would not be visible from the road. He further stated that since the application had been submitted, the house had been built with the required sight lines in place, and the hedge would not be moved.

Councillor McAteer proposed to overturn the recommendation to an approval for the following reasons:

- He believed that the application was compliant with CTY1 as the tourism gain from the development should allow the development to be sited within the countryside.
- The site was compliant with TSM6 as there would be no adverse impact on the local area, utilising existing natural boundaries and the design features would help integration concerns.
- The site layout amendment was welcomed as the site rose to the rear made the scheme more amenable, therefore TSM7 was satisfied.
- CTY13 was satisfied as the site would not be unduly prominent given the relocation of the pods and the natural boundaries already in place.
- CTY8 should be set aside to allow the application to go ahead as the tourism generated would bring money into the local economy and while the site may protrude into the countryside, it should be permissible.
- NH6 was satisfied as the quality and design of the materials proposed would help the proposal blend into the special character of the AONB, not erode it.

This 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 McAteer, seconded by Councillor S Murphy, it was agreed to issue an approval in respect of planning application LA07/2024/1386/F contrary to officer recommendation as contained in the Case Officer Report.

(7) LA07/2023/3646/F

On agenda as a result of the Call-In Process

Location:

100m south of No. 32 Glenvale Road, Croreagh, Newry, Co. Down, BT34 2RF

Proposal:

Change of House Type of rural detached dwelling and detached domestic garage in substitution of implemented planning application P/2006/1822/RM, additional landscaping and associated site works

Conclusion and Recommendation from Planning Official:

Refusal

Power-point presentation:

Mr Keane advised that the application sought a change of house type to a previously approved dwelling located in the countryside. He explained that the primary issue was whether the previous Outline and Reserved Matters (RM) permissions had been lawfully commenced within the approved timeframe, which would allow a change of house type to be considered. There had been two prior applications for a change of house type: one refused due to lack of commencement and road concerns, and another withdrawn. The agent had been advised that a Certificate of Lawfulness was the correct method to demonstrate commencement but had declined to pursue this.

Mr Keane noted that aerial photographs from 2006, 2009, 2012, 2016, and 2025 showed foundations for a dwelling and garage in 2006, predating the RM approval in 2007 and in a different location from the subsequently approved development. Claims by the agent regarding other garage foundations were unsupported by aerials, building control records, or a Certificate of Lawfulness, and photographs provided were inconclusive. He concluded that the applicant had failed to provide verifiable evidence of lawful commencement. Consequently, the Planning Department based its recommendation on the available evidence and recommended refusal of the application.

Speaking rights:

In Support:

Mr McKevitt spoke in support of the application, noting that the application sought to regularise a development previously granted planning permission and lawfully commenced prior to its statutory expiry. He stated that the Department had refused the application, but argued that the submission provided clear evidence demonstrating that the original

Mr McKevitt stated that there was no statutory requirement for Building Control inspection to verify lawful commencement and that independent professional verification was sufficient, which he argued had been evidenced. He also highlighted that the Planning Department had confused remnants of unrelated earlier site works with the implemented foundations, and that the applicant had offered to expose the foundations for inspection, which the Department had not taken up.

Councillor D Murphy queried the conflicting statements from the Department and the agent, to which Mr Keane confirmed that the images submitted from the agent were dated after the expiry of the extant planning permission and no evidence had been submitted to verify that work had begun prior to that expiration.

Mr McKevitt argued that he had evidence dated 2010 that evidenced the works had began prior to the permission expiring.

This was seconded by Councillor Devlin.

FOR:	11
AGAINST:	0
ABSTENTIONS:	0

AGREED: On the proposal of Councillor McAteer, seconded by Councillor Devlin, it was agreed to defer planning application LA07/2023/3646/F to allow for a site visit.

Cllr Tinnelly left the meeting at this stage – 2.24pm

(8) LA07/2024/0271/F

On agenda as a result of the Call-In Process

Location:

90m NW of No.30 Killowen Old Road, Killowen, BT34 3AD

Proposal:

Farm shed

Conclusion and Recommendation from Planning Official:

Refusal

Power-point presentation:

Mr Keane advised that the application was for a farm shed, noting that two detailed objections had been received from an interested party, reiterating concerns that the applicant did not have an established and active farm and that no justification had been provided for siting the shed away from other farm buildings. He advised that a further representation had been received the previous day reiterating the same points.

Mr Keane explained that the site was located in the countryside, and that the proposal had been assessed against Policy CTY12. DAERA records indicated that the farm business had only been allocated to the applicant in 2022, with the lands previously in conacre and used by another farm business until June 2022. Consequently, the proposal failed the initial policy test of being located on an active and established agricultural holding. He also noted that there was recent history of a domestic shed application on the same site, which had been refused due to its siting and size. He confirmed that the proposed location was not adjacent to existing farm buildings but to the rear of an unrelated property, and that no evidence had been submitted to demonstrate that existing storage facilities on other lands were unsuitable or that the shed was essential for the holding, nor were there any health and safety justifications. He concluded that the application was contrary to Policy CTY12 and recommended refusal, in line with the officer's report.

Speaking rights:

In Support:

Mr Colin Dalton spoke in support of the application, supported by applicant Mr Daire Carr. Mr Dalton noted that the case officer had cited the proposal as not on an active and established agricultural holding, arguing that the Planning Department had treated the development as non-agricultural, but in his view, it met the criteria of Policy CTY12, rendering the "essential in a rural location" test irrelevant. He explained that the farm business had been active since 2018, with evidence of land management including gorse clearance, paddock fencing, reseeding, lime and fertiliser application, rebuilding of dry-stone walls, and planting of native hedging. This, he stated, satisfied the six-year requirement for agricultural activity under Policies CTY10 and CTY12, although DAERA registration was not possible due to technical requirements for boundary fencing and handling facilities.

Mr Carr highlighted that the case officer had acknowledged the proposal would not unduly impact the character of the location, would have limited visibility, could integrate into the landscape, and would not create ribbon development, complying with Policies CTY13 and CTY14. No objections had been received from Environmental Health or DfI Roads. He emphasised that the shed was essential for the farm's efficient operation, economic viability, livestock welfare, health and safety, and secure storage of machinery and chemicals. The proposed location used the only existing level farmyard surface suitable for safe operations. The shed was also crucial for planned farm expansion, including increased livestock and self-sufficient winter fodder production.

Finally, Mr Carr clarified what he described as inaccuracies in the case officer's report, noting that no bathroom was proposed, only a welfare toilet that had later been removed, that there had been only one objection which had been addressed through amendments reducing the shed's footprint and ridge height, and that supporting evidence of agricultural activity had been omitted from what he referred to as a biased and misleading report. He concluded that the proposal was necessary, justified, and fully supported by evidence, and that the refusal did not accurately reflect the circumstances or policy compliance.

Councillor Rice requested confirmation that the sole reason for refusal was relating to the need for a DAERA Farm ID, to which Mr Keane confirmed that the proposal was contrary to CTY12, part of which was the requirement to have an active and established farm business for a minimum of six years.

Councillor Rice requested legal opinion, with Mr Rooney advising that the Committee should enter closed session to discuss the legal opinion.

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

Agreed: On the proposal of Councillor D Murphy, seconded by Councillor Clarke, it was agreed to exclude the public and press from the meeting during discussion on the following item, which related to exempt information by virtue of para. 5 of Part 1 of Schedule 6 of the Local Government (Northern Ireland) 2014 – information in relation to which a claim to legal professional privilege could be maintained in legal proceedings, and the public may, by resolution, be excluded during this item of business.

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

The Chairperson advised that Legal Opinion had been provided while in closed session.

Councillor Hanna requested confirmation from the applicant regarding the size of his farm holding and his commitment to farming.

Mr Carr advised that he was a category 3 farmer, farming cattle and sheep. He confirmed that he was an accountant and a part time farmer, but was committed to developing his holding but was unable to commit to purchasing a large amount of machinery if it was going to be exposed to the elements without a farm shed to store it in.

Councillor Hanna queried how someone would get into the farming business with the difficult criteria outlined in the policy, noted that the policy needed to be reviewed to encourage new farmers into the industry and asked if there was anything the committee was able to do to support the applicant.

Mr Keane noted that the Planning Department had assessed the application, along with all the evidence submitted by the applicant, including the omitted photos from the applicant, and advised that the application did not meet the outlined policy requirements.

Councillor Devlin queried Mr Carr's statement that the neighbour had retracted their objection, while Mr Keane had confirmed that a late objection had been received and requested clarification on the statement.

Mr Carr stated that he had an email from the objector stating that they were content with the amended proposal but would not retract their original objection, and that this was the first he had heard of the late objection being received.

Councillor Devlin queried if there were circumstances that would allow a shed to be built on the holding, to which Mr Keane confirmed that the farm ID had been allocated in 2022, and as per policy the requirement was 6 years.

Following a query from Councillor McAteer regarding the element of policy relating to agricultural development of the land, Mr Carr stated that he was ineligible to apply for a farm ID prior to 2022 as the farm did not have the required boundary fencing or isolation facilities for animals, although he had invested heavily in the land clearing gorse, repairing stone walls and erecting wire and post fencing. Mr Carr stated that while he plans to acquire more land, he is ineligible to claim farm payments until he has more land.

Councillor Larkin queried the siting of the shed, behind a neighbouring house and not his own, to which Mr Carr stated that the uphill gradient of the land to the rear of his own dwelling rendered it visible from the road, while the proposed location was flat and ideal for the safe coupling of machinery.

Councillor Larkin proposed to accept the officer's recommendations, noting that it was unfortunate that policy required the active and established farm for six years. This was seconded by Councillor Hanna.

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

FOR:	7
AGAINST:	3
ABSTENTIONS:	0

The proposal was declared carried.

AGREED: **On the proposal of Councillor Larkin, seconded by Councillor Hanna, it was agreed to issue a refusal in**

**respect of planning application LA07/2024/0271/F
supporting officer recommendation as contained in the
Case Officer Report.**

(9) LA07/2025/0178/F

On agenda as a result of the Call-In Process

Location:

146 Mill Road, Mullartown, Annalong, BT34 4RH

Proposal:

Extension & Alterations to Dwelling including 1 1/2 Storey Side Extension and Roof space Conversion

Conclusion and Recommendation from Planning Official:

Refusal

Power-point presentation:

Mr Keane advised that this was a full application for alterations and extensions to an existing single-storey dwelling that included extensions to the front, side, and rear of the property. He noted that while the Planning Department had no objection in principle to an extension, the submitted design was considered unacceptable and that despite advice from officers, no amendments or reductions were made by the agent.

Mr Keane stated that the primary concern related to the side extension, which stepped up from the existing bungalow to appear as a full two-storey element. Mr. Keane stated that its scale, massing, and design were not sympathetic to the existing dwelling and would detract from the character and appearance of the area and that although some mature vegetation provided screening, the roadside position meant the extension would remain visible and appear as a dominant and disproportionate addition to the property.

Mr Keane also noted that the agent had referenced another property at No.41 Mill Road, but explained that example differed as its higher two-storey section was the main element, with a subordinate return to the side—consistent with policy, unlike the current proposal. The application was recommended for refusal as it was contrary to PPS 7 EXT 1 and NH6 of PPS 2.

Speaking rights:

In Support:

Mr Rooney stated that the Planning Department had placed excessive reliance on guidance rather than the actual policy text, which clearly required each proposal to be judged on its own merits. In this case, he said, the modest height increase maintained a stepped roof form, used matching materials, and was largely screened by dense mature vegetation, rendering the extension barely visible from the road and not visually dominant. The footprint increase was only around 5%, which he said could not reasonably be described as disproportionate. He further contended that the Department's insistence that the extension remain below the existing ridge height was not a specific policy requirement and had been afforded undue weight. He cited a Planning Appeals Commission decision (2021/A0120),

where strong boundary screening was accepted as mitigating concerns over scale, a principle he said applied equally in this case.

Mr Rooney stated that the design, scale, and materials were appropriate for the locality and consistent with nearby properties, including stepped ridge and one-and-a-half storey dwellings along Mill Road. The mature screening ensured there would be no significant change in the appearance of the dwelling from public viewpoints or any adverse impact on the wider AONB landscape. He also highlighted that the extension was necessary to meet the applicant's genuine family needs, noting that policy guidance recognised that larger extensions could be acceptable where they modernised rural homes.

Councillor Rice queried whether the Planning Department accepted the applicant's argument that there were similar houses within the area, and that there was significant screening already in place.

Mr Keane stated that there was a mix of houses within the area, but that the similar dwellings were well proportioned and generally aligned with policy. He stated that this proposal was contrary to the Justification and Amplification (J&A) text of the policy. He acknowledged that there was existing vegetation on site that would screen some of the proposal, however as this was a roadside plot and the proposal was larger than the existing dwelling, it would be highly visible.

Mr Rooney stated that the proposal design was common to the area, and that the J&A guidance allowed for a smaller rural property to be increased.

Councillor Hanna queried if the applicant would be happy to accept a condition that the existing screening could not be amended or removed, to which Mr Rooney confirmed that was acceptable.

Councillor Hanna queried the character of the area, noting that he was aware of at least 12 dwellings that were similar to the proposed.

Mr Keane noted that there were a mix of dwellings within the area that generally aligned with policy in terms of proportion, scale and massing, however this proposal did not align with policy and stepping up, as proposed, was consistently resisted in policy.

Councillor Hanna queried whether there was an acceptable height increase that the Department could approve, to which Mr Keane stated that policy J&A stated that the design should be stepped down, not up as was the case in this application.

Councillor Rice proposed to overturn the recommendation to an approval, stating that he believed the design would be sympathetic to the area and would not have any undue impact on the character of the area. He stated that he believed the site's mature boundary would help screen the proposal and help it to comply with policy.

This was seconded by Councillor Hana, with a condition that the existing vegetation not be removed.

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

FOR:	8
AGAINST:	1

ABSTENTIONS: 1

The proposal was declared carried.

AGREED: On the proposal of Councillor Rice, seconded by Councillor Hanna, it was agreed to issue an approval in respect of planning application LA07/2025/0178/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.

**The meeting did then recess – 3.29pm
The meeting did then resume – 3.35pm**

(10) LA07/2024/1191/O

On agenda as a result of the Call-In Process

Location:

Immediately N. of 4 Lurgancahone Road, Rathfriland, BT34 5A

Proposal:

Proposed Dwelling and Garage

Conclusion and Recommendation from Planning Official:

Refusal

Power-point presentation:

Mr. Keane stated that the application was an outline proposal for a dwelling and garage located in the countryside, where the relevant policies of PPS21 were applicable and was recommended for refusal as no principle of development had been established.

Mr Keane advised that the applicant sought to justify the proposal under Policy CTY2a of PPS21, which permitted a dwelling within a cluster where all six criteria were met. However, the Planning Department considered that there was no identifiable cluster, no visual entity, and that the proposal did not represent rounding off or consolidation of an existing cluster and as such, the application failed to meet three of the six policy tests under CTY2a and was recommended for refusal.

Speaking rights:

In Support:

Mr Rooney disagreed with the Planning Department's assessment, arguing that the site clearly formed part of a cluster of development around the crossroads, public house, and GAC grounds. He contended that the buildings in the area were not dispersed but concentrated in a recognisable grouping that met the definition of a cluster under CTY2a. He further stated that the cluster appeared as a visual entity within the landscape, being identifiable and well-known due to the presence of the crossroads, GAC facilities, and public

house. While the Department cited a sweeping bend as breaking visual continuity, he argued that continuity was not required by policy and that the bend instead emphasised the sense of place.

Mr Rooney acknowledged that the Department accepted compliance with criteria (c) and (d), as the site was located adjacent to recognised focal points and bounded on two sides by existing development, and he maintained that the proposal also satisfied criterion (e), representing clear rounding off and consolidation of the existing built form rather than encroachment into open countryside. He added that the Department had accepted compliance with criterion (f) regarding residential amenity, and that the proposal also met the requirements of Policy CTY8, as the road did not interrupt the established frontage.

Councillor Clarke queried whether the focal point could be considered the GAA pitch and crossroads, to which Mr Keane stated that the focal point requirement of policy was not in contention.

Councillor McAteer requested clarity on the refusal reasons, to which Mr Keane reiterated that the Planning Department were recommending refusal as the application did not meet three of the required six criteria of CTY2a, those being that there was no identifiable cluster, no visual entity, and that the proposal did not represent rounding off or consolidation of an existing cluster.

Councillor McAteer queried why the Department felt that there was no cluster, to which Mr Keane stated that there was a church and other facilities in the area, but did not create a cluster as the development was sporadic and dispersed.

Councillor Rice proposed to overturn the recommendation to an approval, stating that he believed that the area appeared as a cluster and therefore complied with all six required criteria of CTY2a and did not offend CTY13 and 14.

This was seconded by Councillor McAteer

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

FOR:	10
AGAINST:	0
ABSTENTIONS:	0

The proposal was declared carried.

AGREED: On the proposal of Councillor Larkin, seconded by Councillor McAteer, it was agreed to issue an approval in respect of planning application LA07/2024/1191/O contrary to officer recommendation as contained in the Case Officer Report.

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

Agreed: On the proposal of Councillor Quinn, seconded by Councillor S Murphy, it was agreed to exclude the public and press from the meeting during discussion on the following item, which related to exempt information by virtue of para. 3 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 Rice, seconded by Councillor McAteer, it was agreed to come out of closed session.

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

P/108/2025 **COMMUNICATION FROM THE HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT DIVISION – ADVANCE NOTICE OF LISTING**

Read: Communication from Historic Environment Division regarding Advance Notice of Listing **(Copy circulated)**

AGREED: **It was agreed on the proposal of Councillor Rice, seconded by Councillor McAteer, to note the communication.**

P/109/2025: **HISTORIC ACTION SHEET**

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

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

There being no further business the meeting ended at 3.55pm

Signed: _____ **Chairperson**

Signed: _____ **Chief Executive**

NB: 53% of decisions overturned