

NEWRY MOURNE AND DOWN DISTRICT COUNCIL

Minutes of Planning Committee Meeting of Newry, Mourne and Down District Council held on Wednesday 27 May 2026 at 10am in the Council Chamber, Downshire Civic Centre, Downpatrick.

Chairperson: Councillor M Larkin

Committee Members in attendance in Chamber: Councillor L Devlin Councillor G Hanna
Councillor D McAteer Councillor D Murphy
Councillor S Murphy

Committee Members in attendance on Teams: Councillor C Enright Councillor M Rice

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

Officials in attendance On Teams: Mr P Rooney, Principal Planner

P/034/2026: APOLOGIES AND CHAIRPERSON'S REMARKS

Apologies were received from Councillors C King, Quinn and Tinnelly.

P/035/2026: DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

P/036/2026: DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN ACCORDANCE WITH PLANNING COMMITTEE PROTOCOL- PARAGRAPH 25

Declarations of Interest in relation to Para.25 of Planning Committee Operating Protocol

Cllrs Clarke, Hanna, Larkin, D Murphy, Quinn and Rice attended a site visit on 22 April 2026.

MINUTES FOR CONFIRMATION

P/037/2026: MINUTES OF PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING OF WEDNESDAY 22 APRIL 2026

Read: Minutes of Planning Committee Meeting of Wednesday 22 April 2026.
(Copy circulated)

AGREED: **On the proposal of Councillor Hanna, seconded by Councillor S Murphy, it was agreed to adopt the Minutes of the Planning Committee Meeting of Wednesday 22 April 2026 as a true and accurate record.**

FOR DISCUSSION/DECISION

P/038/2026: ADDENDUM LIST

Read: Addendum List of Planning Applications with no representations received or requests for speaking rights – Wednesday 27 May 2026.
(Copy circulated)

AGREED: **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 27 May 2026:**

- **LA07/2024/0568/F** - 46 Monaghan Street, Newry, BT35 6AA - Mixed use development to include 1 retail unit and 9 x 2 bedroom apartments
APPROVAL
- **LA07/2024/0563/F** - 30m South East of 22 Rossglass Road South, Killough, Downpatrick, BT30 7RA - Conversion and extension of existing vernacular structure to form a residential dwelling
APPROVAL
- **LA07/2025/0035/F** - 50 Meters South-East of 24 Windsor Hill, Newry City, County Down, Northern Ireland, BT34 1ER, Proposed Full Planning Application for the Erection 1 No. Detached Dwelling House, 1 No. Detached Domestic Garage, Site Access, Associated Car Parking, Ancillary Site Works and Associated Landscaping
APPROVAL
- **LA07/2023/2991/DCA** - Demolition of existing outbuildings and perimeter walls to the rear of nos. 8-18 Sugar Island. Demolition of existing outbuildings and perimeter walls to the rear of nos. 8-18 Sugar Island. • The upgrade and widening of existing entrance from Bank Parade (which is to be facilitated via demolition of the Sean Holywood Arts Centre as proposed by Newry, Mourne and Down District Council under application LA07/2023/2193/F)

and

LA07/2023/2992/F - Lands incorporating nos. 8-18 Sugar Island and associated lands to the rear along with access to be provided via Bank Parade, Newry City. Proposed refurbishment, alterations and rear façade works to nos. 8-18 Sugar Island along with provision of a new lift and stair core to provide 1st and 2nd floor access to no. 16 & 18 Sugar Island. Provision of new office space at 1st and 2nd floor within nos. 16-18 Sugar Island. Façade and alteration works to no. 8 Sugar Island to provide a carriage arch. Demolition of existing outbuildings and perimeter walls to the rear of nos. 8-18 Sugar Island. The upgrade and widening of existing entrance from Bank Parade (which is to be facilitated via demolition of the Sean Holywood Arts Centre as proposed by Newry, Mourne & Down District Council under application LA07/2023/2193/F). The provision of a drive-thru restaurant with associated site works to include for all hard and soft landscaping works. Provision of a bin storage area.

CONSENT / APPROVAL

- **LA07/2025/0186/F** -Lands at Watson's Road/Doran's Hill Newry including lands to the east of Watson's Road - Proposed residential housing development of 176No. dwellings, including sunrooms and garages, landscaping and open space, and upgrading of road infrastructure to include re-alignment of Doran's Hill & Watson's Road with proposed new roundabout and all associated site and access works (change of house type & mix approved under planning reference P/2013/0242/F)

APPROVAL

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT

P/039/2026: PLANNING APPLICATIONS FOR DETERMINATION WITH PREVIOUS SITE VISITS

Cllrs Quinn and Clarke joined the meeting for the below discussion – 10.35am.

Following a query from Councillor Devlin, she declared an interest in the following item and left the meeting at this stage - 10.35am.

(1) LA07/2024/0462/O

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

Location:

Adj to and 20m NE of 137 Tullybrannigan Road, Newcastle

Proposal:

Infill Dwelling and Garage

Conclusion and Recommendation from Planning Official:

Approval

Power-point presentation:

Councillors Clarke and Quinn left the meeting at this stage – 10.56am

Councillor Devlin rejoined the meeting at this point – 10.58am.

P/040/2026: PLANNING APPLICATIONS FOR DETERMINATION

(1) LA07/2023/2230/O

On agenda as a result of the Call in Process. Previously tabled in October 2025.

Location:

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 confirmed that the application sought outline planning permission for a replacement dwelling, with retention of the original dwelling for storage and associated site works at a site 55m east of 29 Clonvaraghan Road. She advised that the application had previously been presented to Committee on 15 October 2025 and had been deferred to allow for the submission of a Listed Building Consent (LBC) application. She noted that the site was located in the countryside, south-east of Clonvaraghan, within the Mourne Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB).

Mrs Ferguson confirmed that an LBC application (LA07/2025/1562/LBC) had since been submitted for works to the gate lodge, a curtilage structure of Ballywillwill House protected under Section 80 of the Planning Act (Northern Ireland) 2011.

She advised that, while the proposed works under the LBC were considered acceptable, this did not establish the principle of replacement under Policy CTY 3. The submitted refurbishment proposals demonstrated that the building was suitable for conversion, which could be considered under Policy BH 8 without the need for replacement or departure from the established curtilage. She further stated that the agent's claim of "planning gain" had been afforded no weight, and that Historic Environment Division support for refurbishment reinforced the potential for conversion and extension rather than replacement.

Mrs Ferguson stated that the proposal engaged SPPS and Policy CTY 3 of PPS 21. She advised that the LBC supported the case for sympathetic refurbishment rather than replacement. As Policy CTY 3 only permitted the replacement of a listed building in exceptional circumstances, and none had been demonstrated, the proposal was considered unacceptable. She added that approval would set an undesirable precedent and refusal was recommended.

Speaking rights:

In Support:

Mr Declan Rooney spoke in support of the application. He advised that the proposal had previously been considered by the Committee in October 2025 and had been deferred to allow for the submission of Listed Building Consent, which had since been approved, although Planning Officers had maintained concerns regarding the replacement of the listed building despite ongoing support from HED.

He argued that the key issue related to the interpretation of Policy CTY3, noting the presumption in favour of retaining listed buildings. He stated that the policy primarily required retention of the structure, with the exceptional circumstances test only applying where demolition was proposed. In this case, he highlighted that the building was to be retained in situ as part of the development and therefore considered the intent of the policy to have been met. He further noted that the policy did not require the building to remain as the principal dwelling or prevent its use as an ancillary structure.

Mr Rooney emphasised that HED, as the statutory consultee, had consistently supported the proposal and that this was a material consideration which should be afforded significant weight.

In response to the addendum report, he stated that reliance on the Listed Building Consent to support a conversion and extension approach was misplaced, as the consent related only to refurbishment and repair works within the existing footprint and did not include any extension proposals or commentary from HED on such works.

He further contended that, even if the exceptional circumstances test were applied, it had been satisfied through the retention and long-term preservation of the building, avoiding the need for significant alterations or extensions that would be impractical for modern family living. He referred to a comparable case in Killinchy, which he considered demonstrated that such an approach was not without precedent.

In conclusion, he stated that the replacement dwelling had been sensitively sited to integrate with the landscape, retain existing features and avoid ribbon development. He considered the proposal complied with Policy CTY3, PPS21, PPS6 and the SPPS, and requested that Members afford significant weight to the retention of the listed building and HED's support and overturn the Officers' recommendation.

In response to a question from Councillor McAteer, Mr Rooney confirmed that the proposal had included the repair and refurbishment of the old gatehouse for use as domestic storage.

In response to a further question regarding the condition of the existing building and the proximity of the proposed new dwelling, Mrs Ferguson advised that policy relating to listed buildings prohibited their replacement except in exceptional circumstances. She stated that relevant policies, including PPS 6, supported the retention, refurbishment and potential extension of listed buildings, and encouraged their preservation in their original form. She further advised that Policy CTY3 clearly restricted the replacement of listed dwellings to exceptional cases only.

Councillor McAteer disagreed with this interpretation. Mrs Ferguson reiterated that this was a matter of planning judgement, confirmed that no exceptional circumstances had been demonstrated, and advised that the existing building could have been restored without the need for a replacement dwelling.

In response to a question from Councillor Hanna regarding the justification for exceptional circumstances, Mr Rooney stated that the primary justification was the retention of the listed structure, which would otherwise have continued to deteriorate. He further advised that water infrastructure to the south of the site could be relocated, but that this would have rendered the project unviable. He added that the existing floor plan had been minimal and would have required significant enlargement to meet modern standards, thereby detracting from the building's architectural merit.

In response to a further question regarding curtilage, Mr Rooney advised that the curtilage was undefined and noted that the example shown in the presentation had extended further beyond the curtilage than the current proposal.

Following further discussion, Mrs Ferguson confirmed that it had been the applicant's responsibility to demonstrate exceptional circumstances and reiterated that, in the Department's view, none had been established. She advised that the proposal reinforced concerns in respect of curtilage, as it represented an extension of development beyond the established curtilage of the listed dwelling. She added that there had been scope to refurbish the existing building which had not been fully explored and reiterated that the application had been unacceptable in policy terms.

In response to a question from Councillor Larkin regarding a timeline for works, Mr Rooney advised that the applicant had been amenable to conditions requiring that works to the existing building be completed prior to commencement of the new dwelling.

Councillor D Murphy proposed that the Committee overturn the officer's recommendation to an approval, stating that it had been unfair to place undue burden on young applicants. He emphasised the importance of retaining the building and considered the separation distance between the existing and proposed buildings to be acceptable.

The proposal was seconded by Councillor Hanna, who emphasised the importance of maintaining older buildings and stated that refusal would be unduly harsh. He added that appropriate conditions be delegated to officers.

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

FOR:	7
AGAINST:	0
ABSTENTIONS:	0

The proposal was declared carried.

AGREED: **On the proposal of Councillor D Murphy, seconded by Councillor Hanna it was agreed to issue an approval in respect of planning application LA07/2023/2230/O, contrary to officer recommendation as contained in the Case Officer Report.**

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

(2) LA07/2024/0308/O

On agenda as a result of the Call in Process.

Location:

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

Proposal:

Site for dwelling and carport

Conclusion and Recommendation from Planning Official:

Refusal

Power-point presentation:

Mrs Loughan outlined that the application sought outline planning permission for a single dwelling to the rear of 8 Hospital Road, Carnagat, Newry. She confirmed that the case officer's report had been taken as read, no representations had been received, and consultees had raised no objections. She advised that the site was located within the settlement limits of Newry, as designated in the Banbridge, Newry and Mourne Area Plan 2015, and that the application had been assessed against the SPPS, Policy QD1 of PPS 7, Policy LC1 of the PPS 7 Addendum, and PPS 6.

Mrs Loughan stated that indicative drawings demonstrated that the proposed dwelling would occupy a prominent, elevated position overlooking adjacent properties, including Nos. 8 and 10 Hospital Road, and would require significant groundworks and retaining structures.

She advised that the proposal was considered out of keeping with the established pattern of development along Hospital Road, and that the siting, extent of land reshaping, and prominent retaining features would be visually intrusive and detrimental to the character and environmental quality of the area. She concluded that the proposal failed to comply with Policies QD1 and LC1 of PPS 7 and that the application was recommended for refusal.

Speaking rights:

In Support:

Mr Colin O'Callaghan spoke in support of the application and advised that the site lay within the settlement limit for Newry, where there had been a presumption in favour of residential development, provided there was no demonstrable harm to local character, environmental quality, or neighbouring amenity. He contended that the proposal had complied with these requirements.

He stated that the site was located within a built-up urban area, was not within a conservation area or an area of special townscape character, and there were no listed buildings in the immediate vicinity. He advised that the site boundaries had been established and that existing vegetation would be retained. He further noted that policy supported increased urban density in accessible locations close to city centres.

Mr O'Callaghan advised that, although the land rose to the rear, the site was positioned below an existing multi-storey apartment development and would be viewed against a backdrop of mature vegetation, thereby limiting its prominence. He added that the size of the site would allow a dwelling to be positioned to avoid overlooking No. 8 Hospital Road.

He emphasised that the application was in outline form, with siting, design, access and landscaping reserved for future consideration, and the applicant remained flexible in this

Location:

Adjacent to and south of 12 Belmont Crescent, Forkhill Road, Mullaghbawn, BT35 9RB

Proposal:

Off-site replacement dwelling and detached garage to include the retention and preservation of the existing building to be used for ancillary storage

Conclusion and Recommendation from Planning Official:

Refusal

Power-point presentation:

Mrs Loughan advised that the application sought outline planning permission for an off-site replacement dwelling and detached garage, including retention of the existing building for ancillary storage. She confirmed that no representations had been received, and consultees had raised no objections.

She noted that the site was located within the countryside, as designated in the Banbridge, Newry and Mourne Area Plan 2015, and that the application had been assessed against the SPPS and Policies CTY 1, CTY 3, CTY 8, CTY 13, CTY 14, CTY 15 and CTY 16 of PPS 21, with retained policies NH2, NH5 and AMP2 also applicable.

Mrs Loughan stated that, whilst the existing building was considered capable of replacement under Policy CTY 3, the proposed off-site location was not justified. She advised that it had not been demonstrated why the replacement dwelling could not be accommodated within or adjacent to the established curtilage, particularly given the applicant's ownership of surrounding lands.

She further noted that the proposal would introduce a new access and result in a dwelling visually linked to existing road frontage development, thereby contributing to ribbon development along Forkhill Road, contrary to Policy CTY 8.

She advised that, although the proposal would not be unduly prominent in isolation, it would contribute to a suburban form of development, eroding the distinction between the rural area and the adjacent settlement limits, resulting in urban sprawl contrary to Policies CTY 14 and CTY 15.

Mrs Loughan concluded that the proposal failed to comply with the SPPS and Policies CTY 1, CTY 3, CTY 8, CTY 14 and CTY 15 of PPS 21, and was recommended for refusal.

Speaking rights:In Support:

Mr Barney Dinsmore spoke in support of the application. He stated that the Planning Department had accepted the principle of development and that the dwelling to be replaced, formerly a gate lodge, exhibited the characteristics of a non-listed vernacular building. He advised that, under Policy CTY 3, the scale, design, services and access arrangements had been considered acceptable, with the principal concern relating to the separation distance between the existing and proposed dwellings.

He advised that the existing dwelling would have been demolished and that issues of sympathetic incorporation did not arise. He acknowledged that Historic Environment Division

had expressed a preference for the retention and reuse of the building, potentially as an outbuilding or for non-residential use, and noted that the applicant also wished to retain it. He added that, given the off-site nature of the proposal, sympathetic incorporation had not been practical.

Mr Dinsmore stated that the proposed site had been selected to avoid backland development and utilised an existing access. He advised that no access had been available adjacent to the existing dwelling due to historic road realignment and that proposed boundary treatments would have been landscaped. He contended that the proposal had complied with Policy CTY 3. He further argued that the proposal satisfied Policy CTY 8, would not contribute to ribbon development, would not erode rural character, and that Policy CTY 14 had not been offended.

In respect of Policy CTY 15, he stated that the proposal represented a form of rounding off and consolidation in proximity to Mullaghbawn, consistent with the aims of the SPPS. He referred to previous similar approvals and contended that the proposal would not result in urban sprawl.

Referring to the site plan, Mr Dinsmore advised that the proposed location had been selected as it provided the only available access. He concluded that the proposal satisfied policy requirements and addressed the reasons for refusal, and requested that the Committee overturn the recommendation and grant approval.

In response to questions from Members, Mr Dinsmore confirmed that the proposed access had been the only available means of entry to the site and advised that alternative siting adjacent to the existing building had not been pursued due to the absence of access, insufficient site area and concerns regarding backland development.

Councillor McAteer noted that the officer's report had identified scope for development adjacent to the existing dwelling and sought clarification regarding access. Mrs Loughan advised that access had been available, potentially via adjoining lands, and that alternative access arrangements could have been achieved, including along existing boundary lines. She further advised that the proposed dwelling had been located approximately 140 metres from the existing building, had not formed part of the established curtilage, and that alternative siting options had not been fully explored despite the applicant's land ownership.

Mr Dinsmore reiterated that no alternative access had been available and maintained that the proposed siting had been the most appropriate. He added that retention of the existing structure had been desirable due to its cultural and historical value, as recognised by Historic Environment Division, and that alternative siting would have required an extended access lane, which would not normally have been supported by the Planning Department.

Councillor McAteer asked if consideration had been given to improving the existing dwelling, and Mr Dinsmore confirmed this was the case.

Councillor Larkin proposed that the Committee overturn the officer's recommendation and grant approval, stating that he considered the proposal to represent a replacement opportunity. He noted that Historic Environment Division had been content with retention of the structure and considered that the proposal did not conflict with Policies CTY 8 and CTY 10, having regard to the level of existing vegetation.

The proposal was seconded by Councillor Hanna, who concurred with Councillor Larkin and stated that he did not consider the development to constitute ribbon development.

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

FOR:	8
AGAINST:	0
ABSTENTIONS:	0

The proposal was declared carried.

AGREED: **On the proposal of Councillor Larkin, seconded by Councillor Hanna it was agreed to issue an approval in respect of planning application LA07/2024/0050/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.

(4) LA07/2024/0097/F

On agenda as a result of the Call in Process.

Location:

70m SW of 11 Coalpit Road, Newry, BT24 2RQ

Proposal:

Proposed replacement dwelling & garage with existing dwelling to be retained for agricultural storage

Conclusion and Recommendation from Planning Official:

Refusal

Power-point presentation:

Mr Keane stated that the application sought full planning permission for a replacement dwelling.

He confirmed that the site was located within the countryside, with the application assessed under PPS 21, in particular Policy CTY 3 for replacement dwellings.

He advised that the existing building was considered to exhibit the essential characteristics of a dwelling, with the external walls largely intact. He noted that the principal issue related to the proposed off-site location and the retention of the existing structure.

Mr Keane stated that the building, together with its associated outbuildings, occupied a sizeable site. He noted that the red line boundary excluded lands to the rear while extending into an adjoining field. It was considered that sufficient land existed within and immediately adjacent to the established curtilage to accommodate a modest replacement dwelling on site. He advised that the curtilage was not so restricted as to justify an alternative location,

and that no evidence had been provided to demonstrate landscape, heritage, access, or amenity benefits arising from the proposed off-site siting.

In respect of retention, he advised that the building was not considered to be vernacular, did not make an important contribution to the locality, and was not worthy of retention. He added that its retention would contribute to an undesirable build-up of development, and that it was not sympathetically incorporated into the proposed scheme, being located outside the curtilage of the replacement dwelling.

Mr Keane further advised that the proposal was contrary to Policies CTY 8 and CTY 14, as the siting would add to ribbon development.

He concluded that the proposal failed to comply with Policies CTY 1, CTY 3, CTY 8 and CTY 14 of PPS 21, and was recommended for refusal.

Speaking rights:

In Support:

Mr Mark Tumilty spoke in support of the application, supported by the Applicants Mrs Laura and Mr James Deane.

Mr Tumilty advised that an application had been submitted for a replacement dwelling on Coalpit Road. He noted that the existing building to be replaced had been accepted by planners as exhibiting the essential characteristics of a dwelling and meeting the policy test in respect of the principle of replacement.

He outlined that the proposal sought an off-site replacement dwelling, together with retention of the existing building for use as a store. He noted that the case officer's report had stated that the off-site location would contribute to ribbon development and would be contrary to Policy CTY 8 of PPS 21.

Mr Tumilty advised that the existing dwelling was located within an active farmyard and that a health and safety report had been undertaken which concluded that locating a new dwelling within the farmyard would be contrary to health, safety and welfare considerations, given the proximity of agricultural buildings, machinery, and animal enclosures, and the lack of adequate separation between domestic and farming activities. He further stated that the report highlighted the risks associated with farm environments, including the potential for accidents and prolonged exposure to hazards, and concluded that introducing a dwelling within the farmyard would significantly increase risk to occupants.

He referred to examples of similar off-site replacement dwellings within the Council area, noting that comparable applications had been approved. He highlighted one such example located adjacent to an existing line of development, and another application which had initially been recommended for refusal but had subsequently been approved by Committee in June 2025. He contended that these examples were comparable to the current proposal and that a consistent approach should be applied.

Mr Tumilty stated that the proposal represented the most appropriate solution for the site, allowing the farm business to continue safely, with the retained building to be used for agricultural storage. He further noted that the case officer's report had accepted that the size, design, finishes, proportions and appearance of the proposed dwelling and garage

were appropriate for the rural setting and in accordance with the “Building on Tradition” guidance.

Ms Laura Deane advised that she and her husband lived and worked in Dublin and that she had grown up in Saval, where her family had longstanding ties. She noted that they had previously lived locally and considered it their home, but that there were no suitable housing options in the area. She stated that the family-owned site offered their only opportunity to return, highlighting the importance of living near her parents for support and future care. She requested the opportunity to return to Saval to raise her family within the local community.

In response to a question from Councillor McAteer regarding the site layout plan shown in the presentation, Mr Tumilty confirmed that it had represented the full plot. He advised that the area to the south comprised a lawn, while the proposed replacement dwelling had been located to the north within an existing cluster. He further confirmed that farmland to the rear was steep and unsuitable for development.

Mr Keane stated that it had been the Department’s view that sufficient space had existed within the site to accommodate a replacement dwelling. Mr Tumilty responded that the area in question had formed part of an active farmyard and that it would have been impractical to locate a modern dwelling within it.

In response to a query from Councillor D Murphy regarding the distance between the existing and proposed dwellings, Mr Tumilty confirmed that the separation distance was approximately 20 metres at its nearest point. Following a further question, Mr Keane reiterated that, in the Department’s view, there had been sufficient land to accommodate a new dwelling adjacent to the existing farm buildings. He added that the health and safety report submitted had been considered generic in nature and had been afforded limited weight, noting that no supporting evidence had been provided to demonstrate that the site operated as an active farm. Mr Tumilty refuted this, stating that no request for such evidence had been made, to which Mr Keane responded that the application had been assessed on the basis of the information submitted.

In response to questions from Councillors D Murphy and Devlin, Mr Tumilty advised that lambing activities had taken place on the farm and that the agricultural buildings had been intended for the storage of supplies associated with the lambing season.

Councillor McAteer proposed that the Committee overturn the officer’s recommendation and grant approval, stating that the existing dwelling formed part of a traditional roadside pattern of development with farmyards to the rear and sides, which he considered incompatible with modern living standards.

This was seconded by Councillor D Murphy, who stated that he afforded weight to the health and safety report, particularly given the proximity of the proposed development to the existing farmyard.

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

FOR:	8
AGAINST:	0
ABSTENTIONS:	0

The proposal was declared carried.

AGREED: On the proposal of Councillor McAteer, seconded by Councillor D Murphy it was agreed to issue an approval in respect of planning application LA07/2024/0097/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.

Councillor Enright left the meeting at this point – 11.54pm.

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

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

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

P/041/2026: JUDICIAL REVIEW UPDATE

Read: Report from Mr J McGilly, Assistant Director of Regenerations, regarding Judicial Review Update **(Copy Circulated)**.

AGREED: It was agreed on the proposal of Councillor Hanna, seconded by Councillor D Murphy, to note the summary update provided and that officers would bring back a report covering the previous five years.

FOR NOTING

P/042/2026: HISTORIC ACTION SHEET

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

