

## NEWRY MOURNE AND DOWN DISTRICT COUNCIL

---

### Minutes of Planning Committee Meeting of Newry, Mourne and Down District Council held on Wednesday 12 November 2025 at 10am in the Council Chamber, Downshire Civic Centre, Downpatrick.

---

**Chairperson:** Councillor M Larkin

**Committee Members in attendance in Chamber:** Councillor L Devlin Councillor C Enright  
Councillor G Hanna Councillor C King  
Councillor D McAteer Councillor D Murphy  
Councillor S Murphy Councillor M Rice

**Committee Members in attendance on Teams:** Councillor J Tinnelly

**Officials in attendance:** Mr J McGilly, Assistant Director: Regeneration  
Ms A McAlarney, Development Manager – Planning  
Mrs B Ferguson, Senior Planning Officer  
Mr M Keane, Senior Planning Officer  
Ms A Loughran, 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/110/2025: APOLOGIES AND CHAIRPERSON'S REMARKS**

Apologies were received from Councillors Clarke and Quinn.

#### **P/111/2025: DECLARATONS OF INTEREST**

There were no declarations of interest.

#### **P/112/2025: 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.**

Items 6 & 7 - Cllrs Hanna, Larkin, D Murphy, S Murphy, Rice and Tinnelly attended a site visit on 23 October 2025

## **MINUTES FOR CONFIRMATION**

**P/113/2025: MINUTES OF PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING OF WEDNESDAY 15 OCTOBER 2025**

Read: Minutes of Planning Committee Meeting of Wednesday 15 October 2025. **(Copy circulated)**

**AGREED:** **On the proposal of Councillor Hanna, seconded by Councillor D Murphy, it was agreed to adopt the Minutes of the Planning Committee Meeting of Wednesday 15 October 2025 as a true and accurate record.**

## **FOR DISCUSSION/DECISION**

**P/114/2025: ADDENDUM LIST**

Read: Addendum List of Planning Applications with no representations received or requests for speaking rights – Wednesday 12 November 2025. **(Copy circulated)**

Councillor McAteer proposed deferring Item 11 (LA07/2024/0642/F) to a future Committee meeting, noting that a newly appointed agent had missed the speaking rights deadline due to being on holiday. This was seconded by Councillor Rice.

Councillor Rice then proposed deferring Item 12 (LA07/2024/0927/O) as the agent had missed the speaking rights deadline because of a family medical emergency. This was seconded by Councillor McAteer.

Councillor McAteer proposed deferring Item 13 (LA07/2024/1303/F) on the basis that the agent had been on holiday and therefore missed the speaking rights submission deadline. This was seconded by Councillor Rice.

**AGREED:** **On the proposal of Councillor McAteer, seconded by Councillor Rice, it was agreed to defer item 11 – LA07/2024/0642/F to a future Committee Meeting.**

**On the proposal of Councillor Rice, seconded by Councillor McAteer, it was agreed to defer item 12 – LA07/2024/0927/O to a future Committee Meeting**

**On the proposal of Councillor McAteer, seconded by Councillor Rice, it was agreed to defer item 13 – LA07/2024/1303/F to a future Committee Meeting**

**On the proposal of Councillor McAteer, 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 12 November 2025:**

- **LA07/2022/1561/F** - Lands at 7 Teconnaught Road and to the rear of 5 and 5a Teconnaught Road Loughinisland - New floodlit GAA pitch with spectator stand, welfare facilities, ball stop nets and perimeter fencing; new floodlit 4G multipurpose training area with perimeter fencing; demolition & conversion of existing farm shed to form new changing and storage with roof-mounted solar PV panels; ball wall practice area and children's play area; partial culverting and re-alignment of stream & associated works

#### **APPROVAL**

**P/115/2025:** **PLANNING APPLICATIONS FOR DETERMINATION (WITH PREVIOUS SITE VISITS)**

**(1) LA07/2024/0401/F**

On agenda as a result of the Call-In Process.  
Previously tabled 15 October 2025.

#### **Location:**

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

#### **PowerPoint Presentation:**

Mr Keane reminded Members of the details of the application, which was an agricultural shed intended to shelter existing animal and stock-handling facilities for the sole purpose of inspecting and treating animals. He noted that the application had previously been presented to the Planning Committee in October 2025, where it had been deferred for a site visit.

He advised that the site was located in the countryside, comprised a small roadside plot with a three walled pen enclosure and gate, with the relevant policy test being Policy CTY 12 of PPS 21 (Agricultural Development). He confirmed that the Planning Department considered the proposal to be contrary to points A-D of that policy, whereby it had not been demonstrated that the shed was necessary for the efficient operation of the holding; the scale was inappropriate for the roadside location; and the isolated siting failed to integrate with the rural landscape, resulting in an adverse impact on 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 structure was not positioned adjacent to existing farm buildings.

#### **Speaking rights:**

Councillors Hanna, Larkin, D Murphy, S Murphy, Rice and Tinnelly attended a site visit on 23 October 2025.

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

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

Councillor Rice referred to comments made during the site visit regarding the Planning Department's view that sufficient sheds already existed on the farm and asked Mr O'Callaghan for his response. Mr O'Callaghan advised that the applicant disagreed, noting that several buildings had recently been demolished and that the proposed structure was required for functional reasons. He stated that a separate isolation area was necessary, as existing buildings were too close to the farm dwellings to serve that purpose.

Councillor Rice queried how isolation had been managed prior to the demolition of sheds, to which Mr O'Callaghan explained that the proposed building was not intended to permanently house animals but was needed for short-term isolation and treatment. Mr Keane clarified that the sheds had been removed to facilitate a new dwelling and reiterated DAERA guidance indicating that fields could also be used as isolation areas.

Following a query from Councillor Hanna regarding the herd, Mr O'Callaghan confirmed that the farm kept cattle and sheep, and that the scale of the proposed shed was necessary to provide adequate cover during treatment. Mr Keane noted that the existing structure measured 7.5m in length, consisted of three walls and a 1.6m fence, whereas the proposed shed was 13.5m long and 3.8m high and would be far more prominent on site.

Councillor Tinnelly queried the suitability of alternative isolation areas, Mr O'Callaghan maintained that the current pen was used for isolation, testing, treatment, and shelter but was no longer adequate, and that the applicant could not continue working in such outdated conditions.

Councillor Tinnelly queried why refusal was recommended in light of this explanation, to which Mr Keane restated that DAERA guidance provided other means of isolation on the holding and that the applicant's operational needs did not outweigh the requirement to meet planning policy.

Councillor Hanna then proposed that the Committee accept the officer's recommendation for refusal, seconded by Councillor Larkin.

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

FOR:	4
AGAINST:	2
ABSTENTIONS:	0

The proposal was declared carried.

**AGREED:**

**On the proposal of Councillor Hanna, seconded by Councillor Larkin, it was agreed to issue a refusal in respect of planning application LA07/2024/0401/F supporting officer recommendation as contained in the Case Officer Report.**

**(2)**

**LA07/2023/3646/F**

On agenda as a result of the Call-In Process  
Previously tabled on 15 October 2025.

**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 reminded Members that the application was a change of house type relating to an earlier dwelling approval, previously deferred in October 2025 for a site visit, stating that that the key issue was whether the original Outline and Reserved Matters permissions had been lawfully commenced before they expired, which would allow a change of house type to be considered. This matter had been addressed in detail within the Case Officer's report. He highlighted that the applicant had already submitted two earlier change-of-house-type applications in 2018 and 2019: one had been refused due to lack of commencement and road concerns, and the other had been withdrawn. The current 2025 submission was therefore the third such application.

Mr Keane confirmed that the Planning Department had reviewed aerial imagery and found no evidence that the previous permission had been commenced within the required timeframe. The agent claimed that garage foundations had long been in place and were merely exposed in October, and these were partially visible during the site visit. However, there was no verifiable evidence to demonstrate that the foundations pre-dated the expiry of the permission: they did not appear on aerial imagery; no Building Control records existed; no Certificate of Lawfulness had been sought; and the photographs provided were inconclusive. He further noted that neither the applicant nor their agent had mentioned these foundations during the 2018 or 2019 applications.

**Speaking rights:**

Councillors Hanna, Larkin, D Murphy, S Murphy, Rice and Tinnelly attended a site visit on 23 October 2025.

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

Mr Barney McKeivitt was present to answer any questions Members may have had.

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

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

FOR:	6
AGAINST:	0
ABSTENTIONS:	0

The proposal was declared carried.

**AGREED:** **On the proposal of Councillor Hanna, seconded by Councillor Larkin, it was agreed to issue a refusal in respect of planning application LA07/2023/3646/F supporting officer recommendation as contained in the Case Officer Report.**

## **DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT**

### **P/116/2025: PLANNING APPLICATIONS FOR DETERMINATION**

The Chairperson advised that item 9 (LA07/2023/3099/O) and item 10 (LA07/2023/3412/O) would be heard together.

#### **(1) LA07/2023/3099/O and LA07/2023/3412/O**

On agenda as a result of the Call-In Process  
Previously tabled 23 July 2025

**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

**Power-point presentation:**

Mr Keane reminded Members that the two outline applications each sought an infill dwelling on a gap site and had previously been brought to Committee in July, when they were deferred for a site visit. Although that visit had taken place, subsequent changes in Committee membership required the applications to be presented again.

Mr Keane confirmed that the sites lay in the countryside and were therefore assessed under PPS21, with both applications recommended for refusal as no planning principle had been established. The proposals were described as infill dwellings under CTY8 in the Design and Access Statements, and while the agent sought speaking rights for both, the written submission only addressed application 3099 and incorrectly referenced CTY2a.

Mr Keane explained that both sites were agricultural fields along Newtown Road. To the south, each site was separated from no.31b by an additional field, and to the north there was an access and several further fields, and that no.33b on the north side, did not have road frontage and was accessed by an access laneway. Also, that the curtilage of No.33b

was set back, fenced, and clearly distinct from the surrounding field. He advised that the Planning Department had prepared a curtilage map showing that the sites did not form part of any substantial and continuous built-up frontage, nor did they represent gap sites under policy CTY8. On that basis, both proposals were considered contrary to PPS21 and were recommended for refusal, consistent with the officers' reports.

**Speaking rights:**

In Support:

Mr John Young spoke in support of the applications, stating that he believed the curtilages of both 31b and 33b extended beyond the boundaries identified by the Planning Department. He noted that no.31b had erected a fence for the keeping of a pony, which, in his view, should be considered part of the private curtilage.

In response to a query from Councillor Devlin regarding the requirement for a substantial and continuous built-up frontage, Mr Young stated that he considered this to comprise no.31, no.33b, and two additional houses to the south.

Following a query from Councillor Devlin regarding evidence for the expanded curtilage of no.33b, Mr Young asked if he could share images from his phone. Councillor Larkin advised that, according to the Operating Protocol, any such information should have been submitted with his speaking rights request.

Councillor Hanna reminded the Planning Department that Members were required to consider the existing conditions on the ground at the application site and queried whether the northern house, surrounded by a steel fence, had road frontage.

Mr Keane referred to aerial images showing the north and south dwellings, their curtilages, and the adjacent agricultural fields. He confirmed that the Planning Department considered the fields were not part of the dwellings' curtilages. He noted that the dwelling to the north had a ranch-style fence enclosing its approved curtilage, clearly separating it from the adjoining field and confirming that it did not have frontage to the road. He further explained that, although the dwelling to the south had originally been approved with an enlarged curtilage, the curtilage that had existed on the ground for a considerable period was reduced and clearly defined by iron railings, with a surrounding field separating it from the application site. He stated that, as a result, there was no continuous frontage.

Councillor Hanna proposed to accept the officer's recommendations. This was seconded by Councillor Larkin.

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

FOR:	9
AGAINST:	1
ABSTENTIONS:	0

The proposal was declared carried.

**AGREED:**

**On the proposal of Councillor Hanna, seconded by Councillor Larkin, it was agreed to issue a refusal in respect of planning application LA07/2023/3099/O**

**and LA07/2023/3412/O supporting officer recommendation as contained in the Case Officer Report.**

**(2) LA07/2024/1570/O**

On agenda as a result of the Call-In Process.

**Location:**

180m NW of 117 Old Belfast Road, Saintfield

**Proposal:**

farm dwelling, garage, and all associated site works

**Conclusion and Recommendation from Planning Official:**

Refusal

**Power-point presentation:**

Mrs Ferguson outlined the application, noted that the Case Officer's report was taken as read, confirmed that no objections had been received and that consultations had returned either no objections or standing advice. She explained that the site was located in the countryside as designated in the Ards and Down Area Plan 2015, and that the application was assessed under the SPPS, Policies CTY 1, CTY 8, CTY 10, CTY 13, CTY 14, and CTY 16 of PPS 21, as well as retained policies in PPS 3.

Mrs Ferguson advised that under Policy CTY 10, planning permission for a farm dwelling was only permitted once every 10 years and that the proposal failed this test as two farm dwellings had already been granted within the 10-year period since PPS 21 came into effect in June 2010. Regarding Policy CTY 13, she highlighted that the site was visible from critical viewpoints along Old Belfast Road and lacked established boundaries, meaning the development could not adequately integrate into the landscape and relied solely on new landscaping. In relation to Policies CTY 8 and CTY 14, Mrs Ferguson explained that while visual linkage or clustering under CTY 10 had a proximity test, the development would still create a visual ribbon along the road as buildings sited back, staggered, or at angles with gaps could still constitute ribbon development if visually linked. She concluded that the proposed dwelling would visually read with existing sheds, undermining the rural character and creating a ribbon of development, thereby contravening CTY 8 and CTY 14.

**Speaking rights:**

In Support:

Mr Stevens advised that the applicant had effectively substituted the earlier planning permission (R/2011/0001/F) with a later permission (LA07/2016/0185/F), and he stated that it was incorrect to suggest that two planning permissions had been taken up under the relevant farm business number. He explained that the Council's approach at the time had created a legitimate expectation that the earlier permission had been replaced by the later one, without prejudice to the applicant. He highlighted issues of administrative fairness, noting that the applicant had only availed of one dwelling approval in approximately seventeen years, despite Policy CTY10 indicating an entitlement to two. Mr Stevens also

explained that the change of application location arose due to the death of the applicant's husband and her wish to reside beside her son and other farm holdings.

Regarding the refusal reason relating to ribbon development, Mr Stevens stated that the Planning Appeals Commission had consistently held that a building without road frontage could not contribute to or form part of an existing ribbon of development. He emphasised that Policy CTY10 required new development to be visually linked or clustered with existing farm buildings, and that the established planning history was a significant material consideration under the 2011 Act. He asserted that a building could not extend a ribbon of development if it had no road frontage, even if a ribbon were otherwise accepted to exist.

Councillor Hanna noted his confusion regarding the application dates and subsequent builds on the farm and requested clarification on what had actually been constructed.

Mr Stevens acknowledged the complex case history and confirmed that one house had been built, and that the 2016 application had been implemented, effectively substituting the earlier 2011 approval. He explained that the 2016 permission had been built due to a change in circumstances following the death of the applicant's husband, despite the original 2011 approval being in place.

Councillor Hanna sought clarification on the term "substitution," and Mr Stevens reiterated that the 2016 approval had been constructed, replacing the 2011 permission in practical effect due to the intervening circumstances.

Councillor Hanna requested a legal opinion, noting ongoing confusion over the application dates and terminology.

Mr Rooney stated that planning policy clearly limited farm dwelling permissions to one every ten years, which underpinned the Planning Department's refusal recommendation.

Councillor Devlin queried when the ten-year period began and whether any circumstances might allow deviation. Mrs Ferguson advised that as the March 2019 application had been implemented, the applicant would not be entitled to another build opportunity until March 2029.

Councillor McAteer proposed to accept the officer's recommendations. This was seconded by Councillor Enright.

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

FOR:	9
AGAINST:	1
ABSTENTIONS:	0

The proposal was declared carried.

**AGREED:**

**On the proposal of Councillor McAteer, seconded by Councillor Enright, it was agreed to issue a refusal in respect of planning application LA07/2024/1570/O supporting officer recommendation as contained in the Case Officer Report.**

**(3)**

**LA07/2024/0783/F**

On agenda as a result of the Call-In Process.

**Location:**

Lands adjoining and 50m south of 74 Carsonstown Road, Saintfield

**Proposal:**

Proposed stable building, access and associated site works

**Conclusion and Recommendation from Planning Official:**

Refusal

**Power-point presentation:**

Mrs Ferguson outlined the application and noted that the case officer's report was taken as read. She confirmed that no objections had been received and that DfI Rivers and DfI Roads had responded with no objections and standing advice. She explained that the site was located in the countryside as designated in the Ards and Down Area Plan 2015, and that the proposal was assessed under the SPPS, Policy OS 1 of PPS 8, and Policies CTY 8, CTY 13, CTY 14, and CTY 16 of PPS 21, along with relevant retained policies in PPS 2, PPS 3, and PPS 15.

Mrs Ferguson advised that the proposal was contrary to Policies CTY 8, CTY 13, and CTY 14, as detailed in the officer's report, explaining that the proposed stables would be sited in an open roadside field, leaving a notable gap between No. 74 and the development. She noted that the site lacked long-established boundaries and would rely heavily on new landscaping for integration. She further stated that the development would create ribboning along the road frontage when read alongside No. 74, which would harm the rural character, a scenario consistently resisted under policy.

**Speaking rights:**

In Support:

Mr Fay explained that the application was acceptable in principle if it complied with the policy criteria set out in PPS 8, noting that the case officer's report confirmed compliance with seven of the eight criteria, with the only disputed point relating to visual amenity and landscape integration. He addressed these concerns, stating that the stables were modest in scale, sited below road level, and screened by mature trees and hedging, highlighting that the design had been revised, reducing the number of stables from five to three, lowering the ridge height, and dropping the floor level, so that only a small portion would be visible above the roadside hedge. He asserted that the proposal effectively used existing vegetation and topography to integrate into the landscape, complying with PPS 8 and Policies CTY 13 and CTY 14.

Regarding Policy CTY 8 on ribbon development, Mr Fay explained that although the site was roadside, the separation from No. 74 Carsonstown Road, combined with mature vegetation and level differences, prevented any perception of a continuous built-up frontage. He

confirmed that the modest stables would not be inter-visible with the existing dwelling and therefore would not constitute ribbon development.

Following queries from Councillor Devlin regarding the location of the septic tank, Mrs Ferguson confirmed that while the tank had been considered, it was not a determining factor and would not outweigh concerns regarding ribbon development. She noted that alternative locations existed, such as a side garden or a piece of land to the rear outside the flood plain.

Councillor Devlin asked Mr Fay for his opinion on these alternatives, to which he confirmed that they had been considered but rejected as the rear land was used for the septic tank soakaway, and the garden space was needed for the applicant's young family to have a safe play area. He added that a 50m gap between the proposed stables and No. 74 negated the ribbon development concern.

Councillor Larkin queried why the stables were not sited behind the existing garden, as referenced in the case officer's report, to which Mr Fay explained that this land was constrained by floodplain restrictions and was also used for the septic tank soakaway, as confirmed by Land & Property Services maps.

Councillor Hanna proposed to overturn the recommendation to an approval, stating that stables could only realistically be sited in the countryside and noted that the agent had confirmed the proposal was a small-scale build. He acknowledged that the Planning Department had indicated the stables could be integrated with planting and stated that, while the structure would be somewhat visible from the south depending on foliage and season, it could be integrated without significant issues. He further noted that, although alternative sites might exist, the proposed location best suited the activity associated with the stables. Regarding ribbon development, he accepted the agent's assertion that the gap between the proposal and No. 74 was sufficient to mitigate the refusal reason.

This was seconded by Councillor Devlin.

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

FOR:	9
AGAINST:	1
ABSTENTIONS:	0

The proposal was declared carried.

Mr Fay took the opportunity to commend the Planning Department and the Case Officer involved in the application for their integrity, professionalism and diligent work ethic during the processing of the application.

**AGREED:**

**On the proposal of Councillor Hanna, seconded by Councillor Devlin, it was agreed to issue an approval in respect of planning application LA07/2024/0783/F contrary to officer recommendation as contained in the Case Officer Report.**

**(4)**

**LA07/2024/0459/F**

On agenda as a result of the Call-In Process

**Location:**

Land to the rear of 32 Newcastle Road & adjacent to 7 Burrenwood Road, Castlewellan

**Proposal:**

Proposed 2no. semi-detached dwellings

**Conclusion and Recommendation from Planning Official:**

Refusal

**Power-point presentation:**

Mrs Ferguson outlined that the application proposed two semi-detached dwellings within the Castlewellan settlement limits and Mourne AONB, noting three objections had been received, and consultations with NI Water, DfI Roads, DfI Rivers, and Environmental Health had been carried out, with ongoing engagement regarding a submitted Waste Water Impact Assessment.

Mrs Ferguson explained that despite an extant approval for one dwelling, the proposed dwellings were considered out of character with the area due to plot size, layout, building appearance, roof height (8.9m), and form, creating a three-storey visual impression. The Planning department were of the opinion that the proposal would result in three closely spaced accesses, reliance on close-board timber fencing with minimal soft landscaping, and excessive ancillary works, leading to negative visual impact.

Mrs Ferguson concluded that the development would appear "hemmed in," creating perceptions of overlooking and overdominance, failing to maintain the rhythm of existing frontages and usable front amenity areas and would not be sympathetic to the special character of the AONB or locality.

**Speaking rights:**

In Support:

Mr Martin argued that the proposal for two semi-detached dwellings was consistent with the established character of the residential area, noting that the Planning Department had assessed design and layout based on only a small number of properties, whereas higher-density development existed nearby. He stated that the dwellings respected the building line, had comparable or lower plot density than surrounding properties, and would provide affordable family homes. He highlighted that the three proposed accesses would be less visually intrusive than a previous approval and that existing boundary vegetation would be retained while additional soft landscaping reduced reliance on timber fencing for privacy. He argued that the roof design, featuring hipped or half-hipped roofs, and materials were in keeping with surrounding properties.

Mr Martin confirmed that a Waste Water Impact Assessment had been submitted, with NI Water agreeing to connect the dwellings to mains sewer and stormwater systems, and that network upgrades further mitigated environmental concerns. He asserted that the proposal respected the area's character, integrated appropriately, and complied with the SPPS, PPS 7 Policy QD1, and Policy LC1 of the Addendum to PPS 7.

Councillor Hanna queried the refusal reasons concerning NI Water, and Mrs Ferguson confirmed that any issues could be addressed through a negative condition.

Councillor Enright asked whether sustainable development had been considered, and Mrs Ferguson confirmed it had, but noted that the Planning Department also needed to account for policy compliance and other material considerations.

Councillor Larkin questioned the refusal reason regarding boundary fencing, noting it was similar to existing fencing on site. Mrs Ferguson clarified that the fencing would need to be removed to provide access and egress for the proposed dwellings, which was not considered consistent with the typical pattern of development in the area.

Councillor Rice proposed overturning the recommendation to approve the application, stating that the proposal was in keeping with the character of the residential area, respected the surrounding context, and was therefore compliant with Policies QD1 and LC1 of PPS7.

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:	8
AGAINST:	2
ABSTENTIONS:	0

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 LA07/2024/0459/F contrary to officer recommendation as contained in the Case Officer Report.**

**The meeting did then recess – 11.57am**  
**The meeting did then resume – 1204pm**

**(6) LA07/2025/0482/O**

On agenda as a result of the Call-In Process

**Location:**

50m S. of No.32 Tullyah Road, Belleeks, Newry, Co,Down, BT35 7QP

**Proposal:**

Erection of dwelling and domestic garage in gap/infill site.

**Conclusion and Recommendation from Planning Official:**

Refusal

**Power-point presentation:**

Ms Loughran outlined the application, noting that the case officer's report was taken as read, no representations had been received, and all issues were addressed in the report.

Statutory consultees had raised no objections. The site lay in the countryside under the Banbridge, Newry & Mourne Area Plan 2015, and the proposal was assessed under SPPS and Policies CTY 1, CTY 8, CTY 13, CTY 14, and CTY 16 of PPS 21, alongside retained policies NH2, NH5, and AMP2.

Ms Loughran confirmed that under Policy CTY 8, while there was substantial and continuous built-up frontage with adjacent properties, the proposed 55.3m frontage, combined with visibility constraints from the steep road gradient, would result in a visual break and was therefore out of keeping with the established development pattern. She further noted that under Policies CTY 13 and CTY 14, the proposal would contribute to ribbon development along Tullyah Road and negatively impact the rural character.

**Speaking rights:**

In Support:

Mr John Young spoke in support of the application, arguing that from the garden of No. 32 it appeared there was no room for an additional dwelling. He stated that he had recorded different frontages and curtilages than those noted in the case officer's report. He also highlighted that, when viewed along Tullyah Road, the road's gradient meant there were no significant visual breaks, and this should be considered when assessing the site.

Councillor Hanna sought clarification on CTY8, noting that it typically allowed no more than two infill dwellings, and asked whether this single-dwelling application should be treated as "half" of a CTY8 proposal.

Ms Loughran explained that while CTY8 applications often involved two dwellings, a single-dwelling application could still be assessed on its own. However, the Planning Department needed to consider the overall plot size and potential for additional dwellings. She confirmed that the gap was large enough to accommodate more than two dwellings, meaning the proposal did not comply with CTY8.

Councillor McAteer queried the differing interpretations of road frontages raised by Mr Young and Ms Loughran. Mr Young stated that a log cabin within the curtilage of No. 32 reduced the gap to 100m, which he argued ensured compliance with CTY8.

Following Councillor McAteer's query about the log cabin, a discussion ensued, the outcome of which was Mr Young stated that the log cabin, though not visible on the Google images shared, was in place, while Ms Loughran confirmed that there was no planning permission for the log cabin and that it had only been in situ for three years, meaning it was not immune from enforcement action.

Councillor D Murphy proposed a site visit for the application, 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 D Murphy, seconded by Councillor Hanna, it was agreed to defer planning application LA07/2025/0482/O to allow for a site visit.**

**P/117/2025:** **HISTORIC ACTION SHEET**

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

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

**P/118/2025:** **RESPONSE TO LOUTH COUNTY COUNCILS PRE-DRAFT STRATEGIC ISSUES PAPER 2027 - 2033**

Read: Report from Mr J McGilly, Assistant Director: Regeneration, regarding Response to Louth County Council's Pre-Draft Strategic Issues Paper 2027 - 2033 (**Copy circulated**)

**AGREED:** **It was agreed on the proposal of Councillor Hanna, seconded by Councillor Larkin, to note the representation response NMDDC Response to Louth County Council's Notice of Intention to review the Louth County Development Plan 2021 – 2027 and to prepare a new Louth County Development Plan 2027 – 2033 (Appendix A).**

**P/119/2025:** **RESPONSE TO ARDS AND NORTH DOWN BOROUGH COUNCIL'S DRAFT PLAN STRATEGY**

Read: Report from Mr J McGilly, Assistant Director: Regeneration, regarding Response to Ards and North Down Borough Council's Draft Plan Strategy. (**Copy circulated**)

**AGREED:** **It was agreed on the proposal of Councillor Hanna, seconded by Councillor Larkin, to note the representation response to Ards and North Down Borough Council's Local Development Plan – Draft Plan Strategy (Appendix 1).**

**There being no further business the meeting ended at 12.19pm**

**Signed:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Chairperson**

**Signed:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Chief Executive**

**NB: 25% of decisions overturned**