

NEWRY, MOURNE & DOWN DISTRICT COUNCIL

Minutes of the Planning Committee Meeting of Newry, Mourne and Down District Council held on Wednesday 10 March 2021 at 10.00am via Microsoft Teams

Chairperson: Councillor R Burgess

In attendance: (Committee Members via Teams)

Councillor P Brown
Councillor G Hanna
Councillor V Harte
Councillor M Larkin
Councillor D McAteer
Councillor D Murphy
Councillor G O'Hare
Councillor G Stokes
Councillor J Tinnelly
Councillor J Trainor

(Officials)

Mr C Mallon	Director Enterprise Regeneration & Tourism (via Teams)
Mr A McKay	Chief Planning Officer
Mr P Rooney	Principal Planning Officer
Mr A Hay	Principal Planning Officer
Mr M McQuiston	Senior Planning Officer (via Teams)
Ms A McAlarney	Senior Planning Officer (via Teams)
Mr M Oliver	Planning Officer (via Teams)
Mr F O Connor	Legal Advisor (via Teams)
Ms N Largey	Legal Advisor
Ms S Taggart	Democratic Services Manager (via Teams)
Ms C McAteer	Democratic Services Officer (via Teams)
Ms P McKeever	Democratic Services Officer (via Teams)

P/020/2021: APOLOGIES AND CHAIRPERSON'S REMARKS

Apologies were received from Councillor S Doran.

P/021/2021: DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

No declarations of interest.

P/022/2021: DECLARATIONS IN ACCORDANCE WITH PLANNING COMMITTEE PROTOCOL PARA. 25 – MEMBER TO BE PRESENT FOR ENTIRE ITEM

Item 6 - LA07/2020/0788/F - Councillor Brown did not take part in the discussion/decision on this application.

Item 7 - LA07/2020/0843/LBC - Councillor Brown did not take part in the discussion/decision on this application.

MINUTES FOR CONFIRMATION

P/023/2021: MINUTES OF PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON WEDNESDAY 10 FEBRUARY 2021

Read: Minutes of Planning Committee Meeting held on Wednesday 10 February 2021. **(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 held on Wednesday 10 February 2021 as a true and accurate record.

FOR DISCUSSION/DECISION

P/024/2021: ADDENDUM LIST

Read: Addendum List of Planning Applications with no representations received or requests for speaking rights – Wednesday 10 March 2021. **(Copy circulated).**

AGREED: On the proposal of Councillor Stokes seconded by Councillor O’Hare it was agreed to remove the following Planning Application from the addendum list to allow for full presentation at the next Planning Committee Meeting.

- **LA07/220/0299/F** – single storey dwelling – adjacent to 7 Annacloy Road North, Dunnanelly, Downpatrick **REFUSAL**

AGREED: On the proposal of Councillor Stokes seconded by Councillor Trainor it was agreed to approve the Officer recommendation in respect of the following applications listed on the addendum list for Wednesday 10 March 2021:

- **LA07/2020/1155/F** - Proposed football ground to accommodate the relocation of Newcastle Football Club. Development comprises 3no football pitches(1no full sized intermediate standard grass pitch, 1no U12 grass pitch and 1no small sided 3G games Pitch), new access to church Hill, Club house, temporary portacabin for use as temporary changing facilities, equipment store, ball stop netting, spectator seating, fencing, car parking, new entrance gates, landscaping and associated works - Lands approx. 15m west of No 1 Church Hill and approx. 50m south of No's 2-7 Country Cottages Church Hill Newcastle **APPROVAL**

- **LA07/2020/1258/F** - Multi-use, non-bitmac, compacted gravel community trails - Daisy Hill Wood, Pound Road, Newry
APPROVAL

**DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT -
PLANNING APPLICATIONS FOR DETERMINATION**

P/125/2021: PLANNING APPLICATIONS FOR DETERMINATION

The following applications were determined by the Committee.

The Chairman advised that Planning Applications (1) LA07/2020/0788/F and (2) LA07/2020/0843/LBC would be determined together.

(1) LA07/2020/0788/F

Location:

Mourne Park House Mourne Park Kilkeel Newry BT34 4LB.

Proposal:

Creation of a new luxury hotel incorporating a spa, function room, restaurant, manager's quarters, associated facilities and car parking, by way of change of use and refurbishment of existing listed private residence and provision of a new build extension, gate lodge, associated site works and minor realignment of the existing access gates at the White Water entrance

Conclusion and Recommendation from Planning Official:

Refusal

(2) LA07/2020/0843/LBC

Location:

Mourne Park House Mourne Park Kilkeel Newry BT34 4LB

Proposal:

Refurbishment of and extension to existing fire damaged Mourne Park House and associated outbuildings to create a new luxury hotel comprising of hotel bedrooms, restaurant, function room, spa facilities, associated car parking and site works

Conclusion and Recommendation from Planning Official:

Refusal

**Speaking rights:
(via Teams)**

In support:

Mr Karl Pedersen, Architect presented in support of the application, detailing and expanding upon a written statement that had been circulated to Committee Members.

Mr McKay advised that as full presentations had been given at the Planning Committee Meeting on 10 February 2021 in relation to Planning Applications LA07/2020/0788/F and LA07/2020/0843/LBC, and a site visit had subsequently taken place, he did not intend to

revisit the presentations. He advised the Committee Members that Nicola Golden from HED Historic Buildings, Andrew Gault and Adrian McAleenan from Historic Monuments were in attendance via Teams, to answer any questions pertaining to the proposal.

Issues raised:

In response to a request from Councillor Larkin to Mr Pederson to outline the benefits the proposal would have, Mr Pederson listed the following points:

1. It was the only available option to secure the future of Mourne Park House buildings and historic landscape.
2. There was full public and business sector support for the scheme.
3. The gardens would become accessible to the public.
4. The proposal would result in 55,000 visitors to Newry, Mourne & Down annually
5. It would act as a catalyst for Covid recovery.
6. It would have a very significant economic impact within the Council area, with £30M injected into the construction economy, £3.5M to the payroll economy, £1.7M to the supply chain economy, the creation of 430 construction jobs and 120 full time jobs.

Mr Pederson said the issue of concern from a planning perspective was the size of the proposed development, however, he said the scheme was the size it needed to be to be economically viable. Mr Pederson also said if the Committee were to grant planning permission, they would be content to accept any conditions that were attached.

Mr Gault clarified there were two sections within the planning team of HED: 1. Historic Monuments Section and 2. Historic Buildings Section. Mr Gault said he and Mr McAleenan were from Historic Monuments Section and they would be commenting in the context of Policy BH6 – design landscape and Ms Golden would be commenting in the context of listed buildings.

Ms Golden said conditions had been raised by Historic Buildings Section to help satisfy policies BH7 and BH8. She said they had requested detailed sections showing connections between old and new. She said she accepted the house was burned out but it was listed in its own right as a Grade B+, she said the two outbuildings to the rear remained largely intact and were listed Grade B1. Ms Golden said they would normally expect more detail to have been provided and while she accepted they were open to a change of use and that some degree of development was necessary to facilitate the new build portion, she considered the extent of the development was the main issue of concern.

Mr Gault said the issues raised under BH6 could not be addressed by conditions.

Ms Golden said the HED did not take financial viability into consideration in their determination and Mr Gault added they commented under the framework of Planning Policy PPS6 which did not make any consideration for any financial viability.

Ms Golden cited several similar type projects that had been restored as private dwellings and said there was nothing to stop a private owner from opening the gardens to the public.

Mr Pederson said in relation to Policy B6 – protection of parks and gardens, there was no mechanism in place for the upkeep of the buildings and landscape and the proposal would safeguard both landscape and the gardens, but if not granted there would be a loss and harm caused to the historic landscape.

Mr Pederson said he considered that sufficient information had been submitted to the planning application to be processed and best practice had been followed.

Mr McKay said they had assessed the application based on the information submitted and considered it to be unacceptable in planning terms. He added their colleagues in HED had agreed the scale of the proposal would have such an adverse impact that it could not be recommended for approval. Mr McKay said the current proposal made provision for 120 beds and agreed the overall scale and size had been reduced, but did not go far enough, and although he accepted the 7 benefits outlined by Mr Pederson, he said on balance he could not give determining weight to them against the genuinely held concerns in terms of the impact on the historic environment.

Mr Pederson said he disagreed with the comments made by Mr McKay and said the scheme had been adjusted in numerous ways to try and appease the concerns raised by HED. He said the proposal would address some of the points raised in the Council's Tourism Strategy. In response to a query regarding the removal of trees, Mr Pederson said there were currently 120 trees, they proposed to remove 12, which were coming to the end of life, and replacing them with an additional 340 trees.

Councillor Murphy referred to Killeavey Castle saying it was an example of a disused and dangerous building that had been restored and its future secured and asked HED if they believed the proposal would secure the future of the buildings and gardens.

Mr Gault said the restoration to Killeavey Castle had resulted in an adverse impact to the landscape and was in the process of being removed from the list of heritage assets.

Mr McKay said it was quite likely if the scheme got planning approval, the house and gardens would be restored to something resembling their former glory, but the impact would be such that it would result in it being removed from the list of heritage assets. Planning had requested evidence to justify the size and scale to restore the house and gardens but had received information suggesting it was a profitable undertaking, Mr McKay said this was insufficient information to conduct a proper assessment. Mr McKay continued, saying Newry Mourne and Down District Council had approved planning applications specifically for hotel development in the area that met the shortfalls identified.

Councillor McAteer asked the HED if some of the concerns raised regarding the retainment of character and setting of the proposal could be addressed. Ms Golden said the main concern from a historic buildings perspective came under Policy BH11 and was primarily the scale of the extension and although she accepted the applicant had made efforts to reduce the impact he had not reduced the accommodation provision and consequently the size of the function room and extent of car parking required to serve the accommodation resulted in the development having dominance over the listed building. Mr Gault said the proposal had been assessed against paragraph 5.3 of Policy BH6 in terms of impact, design concept, overall quality and setting, trees and woodland and the site's contribution to local landscape character and historic views. The house and parkland around it were carefully designed in the early 19th century to have a particular character, which was still evident today. Mr Gault said the proposal would involve putting a very large development into what was designed to be trees, landscape and pasture, resulting in changing the topography of the site and would be contrary to the points that Policy BH6 set out to protect.

Councillor McAteer asked Mr Pederson if the design could be altered to reduce the height of the two hip roofs that were sitting above the line of the original buildings. Mr Pederson said they had worked within the constraints of the site and the proposal had been reduced in size to the absolute minimum to still ensure viability. He said the buildings had all been developed over a period of time with the first building in 1806 which was a hunting lodge, then further extensions followed in 1820, 1859, 1892, 1904 and in 1921 the front door was moved from the south to the west. In addition, the approach roads had been changed

various times over the years. Mr Pederson said the current proposal was no different in that it was a continuation of previous ideology and thought processes. Mr Pederson said the proposed buildings had a lower ridge height than Mourne Park House and following discussions with HED they had moved the building back on the site so the main building and buildings behind that became even more prominent. They had taken cognisance of roof heights, eaves heights and window heights. He said because they had been asked to move the building back it would now be located close to the existing buildings at the rear of the site. It was proposed to use high quality materials to produce a 5 star development and had a lot of research in terms of looking at old photographs of the site to try and provide the absolute optimum development.

Mr Gault said the design landscape had been developed in the early – mid 19th century and had survived unchanged. The development of the buildings had been carefully designed to minimise the impact on the main building which was in total contrast to the current proposal.

Ms Golden acknowledged the agent had made efforts to meet the concerns raised by HED, however the accommodation had not been reduced significantly thereby creating a sense of imbalance when compared with the footprint of the existing site plan. She said the function room was of primary concern and they had suggested it be moved to where the tennis courts were currently located, but the agent did not consider this would work for the functionality of the hotel. She said the main stumbling block was the extent of the requirements needed to cater for a 120 bedroom hotel. In terms of the viability of the scheme, HED had not been consulted on the other feasibility options, one of which was a boutique hotel with chalets dispersed throughout the site and whilst she could not comment on the extent of the bedroom provision this option would deliver, she said there may have been more opportunity for it to work better within the landscape than the current proposal of one big development to the west of the site.

In response, Mr Pederson said the only financially viable option was the current one and he said there was still a primary house as before, a series of courtyards, as before, and the new wings for the bedrooms created a new 21st century courtyard, which he said just continued the pattern that had been created throughout the years. Mr Pederson disagreed with Mr Gault that the landscape had remained unchanged and said the Jubilee Drive was once the main access route into the site but it was now overgrown and various other changes had taken place over the years, so he considered the character of the landscape had changed and developed.

Mr Gault said his comments did not relate to alterations to the building but rather to the design landscape, which, he considered hadn't changed since the mid 19th century.

In response to Mr Gault's comments, Mr Pederson said the original access route no longer existed. He said the total size of the demesne was 1194 acres and the development application was 10.9 acres which was less than 1% of the total demesne area and therefore he did not consider the proposal impacted in any way on the design of the demesne.

In advance of a proposal being made, Ms Largey raised the following points of clarity:

- Council's Tourism Strategy was not a Planning Policy Document, and in relation to tourism, the policy document to be considered was PPS 16. Whilst the Tourism Strategy was a material consideration, it should not be given determinative weight over Planning Policy PPS16.
- It was the responsibility of the Committee Members to assess the application before them and whilst it was the role of the HED to protect the historic environment, it was

the Council's role to decide what the applicant did with the property, but rather to assess the application in accordance with relevant planning policies and other material considerations.

- It was important to approach the representations from the applicant and agent with a relevant degree of caution and with an enquiring mind. Discussions relating to financial viability were matters of planning judgement for the Committee to decide and there was no requirement for the applicant to discuss viability issues with HED.

Councillor Tinnelly said it went without saying that HED had a very important role to play in these type of applications to protect historic buildings and domains. However as Councillors, when presented with very rare applications such as this, they also had a very important role to play and having listened to all the presentations, they had to adjudicate on two balances. He said in his view the applicant and their agent had made a very compelling argument for the proposal they presented as being the only viable one. He said what he heard from HED guaranteed nothing more than the continued deterioration of and decay of this building, whereas the proposal guaranteed a restoration of this stunning building and site to be preserved for the future.

Councillor Tinnelly proposed to issue an approval in respect of planning applications LA07/2020/0788/F and LA07/2020/0843/LBC, contrary to officer recommendation, based on his comments above.

Councillor Hanna seconded Councillor Tinnelly's proposal to overturn the officer recommendation and grant approval on these applications and said in his view tourism was a material consideration as the Planning Committee sat inside the ERT Department, whose role was also the promotion of tourism, and this application fitted very neatly into this niche. He said there would be substantial gains with the restoration of the house and the retention of the gardens which would now be made available to the whole community. He referred to the CTY reasons for refusal and said this would be a community facility to serve the local rural community and therefore this proposal met Policy. He said from the evidence he had seen during the site visit and reading all the paperwork that had been presented, there would be development on the site to facilitate the scheme but in his view there would be a significant economic impact and this had to be taken into consideration.

Councillor Hanna said there would be a planning gain as there was going to be substantially more trees being planted and policy CTY4 re-use and refurbishment of locally important buildings was being fulfilled as the building in Mourne Park House would be restored and the community would have significant benefit from this. He said under the Strategic Planning Policy Statement the main objection was on the size of the building and whilst he acknowledged there would be an impact but size did matter on a scheme like this for a hotel complex which had to be built to be profitable.

Councillor Hanna said he believed conditions could be attached to any approval so that enough could be done to satisfy HED concerns. He said it was now the 21st century and the site would be gaining a new courtyard.

Councillor Hanna referenced refusal reasons BH6, 7 and 8 and said some of these overlapped to a certain extent and the first big gain was the protection of all the gardens, the existing lake and the swimming pool and the substantial walks from which the whole community would gain advantage from. He said with regard to BH8 a, b and c, extension or alteration of a listed building, he believed conditions could be put on that would address all the essential characteristics of the building, the materials to be used, the architectural detail, to satisfy HED as much as possible.

Councillor Hanna said there would be a significant economic benefit to the Mourne area in particular. He said the Kingdom of Mourne did not have this type of facility and the setting of Mourne Park in 1200 acres was an ideal location for this particular development and the economic benefit to the whole of the Newry and Mourne District was going to be significant.

Nora Largey, legal advisor said the Committee had heard the proposal and there was a lot of detail in it. She asked if Members were minded to vote in accordance with the proposal, before they voted, that it might be appropriate to defer making a final decision to allow officers to go away and work up those reasons for refusal and bring these back through Planning Committee.

The proposer and seconder of the proposal agreed that final authority to finalise the reasons for overturning the officer recommendation and that conditions be delegated to officers.

The Committee then took a short break before moving to a vote on these applications.

When the meeting resumed Nora Largey said that if Members agreed with the proposal to overturn the officer recommendation, that authority be delegated to officers to finalise the reasons for overturning the officer recommendation and that these proposals would be based on comments made by the proposer and seconder. These would be finalised and officers would draw up the conditions based on their delegated authority.

Ms Largey advised this was a major application in respect of which there had been a significant objection from a statutory consultee and therefore Planning legislation required that once Committee made a decision to approve contrary to that objection, then the application had to be referred to the Department and the Department may then decide to call in the application. She said if the Department decided to call-in the application then the Minister would make the decision in respect of the application or alternatively if the decision was made not to call it in the Department would return the application to the Council and then the Council must have a further meeting to finalise its decision in respect of the application.

The proposal to issue an approval in respect of planning applications LA07/2020/0788/F and LA07/2020/0843/LBC, contrary to officer recommendation and to grant authority to officers to finalise the reasons for overturning the officer recommendation on the basis of the comments made by the proposer and seconder, and that conditions be delegated to officers was put to a vote and voting was as follows:-

FOR: 10
AGAINST: 0
ABSTENTIONS: 0

The proposal was declared carried.

AGREED: **On the proposal of Councillor Tinnelly, seconded by Councillor Hanna, it was unanimously agreed to overturn the officer recommendation for the reasons as outlined by the proposer and seconder, and that officers be given delegated authority to write these up referring to relevant Planning Policy, and that officers would also draft conditions based on the comments made by Committee and any other technical issues that may be required. Once this was done the application would be referred to DfI to decide whether or not to call it in and thereafter there would be a further meeting of the**

Committee to make a final determination in respect of the application.

Councillor Harte left the meeting.
Councillor Brown re-joined the meeting.

The Chairman advised that Planning Applications LA07/2020/0485, LA07/2020/0486/DCA and LA07/2020/0487/LBC would be determined together.

(3) LA07/2020/0485/F

Location:

No. 47 Merchants Quay, Newry

Proposal:

864 m² of office space (incorporating the listed building located at No. 47 Merchants Quay, Newry); 518 .3 m² commercial retail space with associated ancillary service yard areas; 1no.coffee bar (54 m²) (within the ground floor of the listed building); 73 (11no. 1-bedroom units and 62 no. 2-bedroom units) (private and social) together with associated landscaped areas, internal communal courtyard and car parking. Proposals include the associated demolition of Nos 46/49/50/51/52/53 & 54 Merchants Quay (located within Newry Conservation Area) and Nos 9/11/13/15 & 17 Cornmarket, Newry. Nos. 46 /47 /49/50 /51 /52 /53 & 54 Merchants Quay Newry together with Nos 9 /11 /13 /15 & 17 Cornmarket Newry

Conclusion and Recommendation from Planning Official:

Approval

(4) LA07/2020/0486/DCA

Location:

Nos 49-54 Merchants Quay and the premises located at No. 46 Merchants Quay, Newry (all designated within Newry Conservation Area) - Nos 46/49/50/51/52/53 & 54 Merchants Quay, Newry.

Proposal:

Conservation area consent application for demolition of the former car sales showroom/garage

Conclusion and Recommendation from Planning Official:

Approval

(5) LA07/2020/0487/LBC

Location:

No. 47 Merchants Quay, Newry

Proposal:

Proposed LBC application for a material change of use of listed building at No. 47 Merchants Quay, Newry from vacant storage unit to proposed commercial use consisting of coffee bar at ground floor with office accommodation above connecting at rear to new proposed office

complex. Works include proposed remedial works to external and internal fabric of listed building including repairs to stonework and brickwork; timber beams/joists and roof structure; re-covering of roof including proposed roof glazing and repair/replacement of timber windows and doors

Conclusion and Recommendation from Planning Official:

Approval

Power-point presentation:

Mr Pat Rooney Principal Planning Officer gave a power point presentation via Teams on the application with supporting information including a site location plan, an aerial view of the site and photographs from various critical views of the site.

**Speaking rights:
(via Teams)**

In support:

Mr Barry Owens, Agent was available via Teams to answer any queries from Members relating to the application.

AGREED: On the proposal of Councillor Stokes seconded by Councillor Hanna it was unanimously agreed to issue an approval in respect of Planning Applications LA07/2020/0485/F, LA07/2020/0486/DCA and LA07/2020/0487/LBC as per the information and recommendation contained in the Case Officer Report presented to Committee.

(7) LA07/2020/0079/O

Location:

Lands approximately 50m north west of No. 53 Ayallogue Road Newry

Proposal:

Dwelling and garage on gap site

Conclusion and Recommendation from Planning Official:

Refusal

Power-point presentation:

Mr Pat Rooney, Senior Planning Officer gave a power point presentation via Teams on the application with supporting information including a site location plan, an aerial view of the site and photographs from various critical views of the site.

**Speaking rights:
(via Teams)**

In support:

Mr Colin O'Callaghan, agent presented in support of the application, detailing and expanding upon a written statement that had been circulated to Committee Members.

Issues raised:

- Mr O'Callaghan considered No. 53 should form part of the frontage, however Planning disagreed with this saying the curtilage of No. 53 was clearly demarcated with fencing some distance from the roadside.
- Planning considered the gap to be capable of accommodating more than two houses, therefore the application contravened policy.

AGREED: On the proposal of Councillor Larkin seconded by Councillor Hanna it was agreed to defer Planning Application LA07/2020/0079/0 for a site visit to take place to allow Members to assess the site in more detail.

(8) LA07/2020/1000/O**Location:**

Lands between 5 and 9 Billy's Road, Ballyholland, Newry

Proposal:

Proposed infill dwelling

Conclusion and Recommendation from Planning Official:

Approval

Power-point presentation:

Mr Mark Keane, Senior Planning Officer gave a power point presentation via Teams on the application with supporting information including a site location plan, an aerial view of the site and photographs from various critical views of the site.

**Speaking rights:
(via Teams)**In objection:

Mr Ciaran Murtagh, local resident presented in objection to the application, detailing and expanding upon a written statement that had been circulated to Committee Members.

Councillor D McAteer spoke in objection to the application on behalf of local residents.

In support:

Mr Anthony Grimes, agent presented in support of the application, detailing and expanding upon a written statement that had been circulated to Committee Members.

During Mr Grimes presentation, a technical fault occurred, and Mr Grimes was unable to rejoin the meeting via Teams, only via telephone. Ms Largey said that technically, a proposal could not be accepted until all deputations had been heard and in the interests of fairness, Mr Grimes had not had the opportunity to present fully to the Committee, however, she said as there was no provision in the protocol to cover this issue, it was best to be guided by Mr Grimes as to whether he wished to proceed to a proposal or choose to defer. Mr Grimes advised he was happy to proceed.

Councillor Larkin said he considered the aerial photographs and site plan was not enough to take on board the concerns of the objectors, and he proposed to defer Planning Application

LA07/2020/1000/0 for a site visit to take place so Members could assess the site in more detail.

AGREED: On the proposal of Councillor Larkin seconded by Councillor Stokes it was agreed to defer Planning Application LA07/2020/1000/0 for a site visit to take place so Members could assess the site in more detail.

(9) LA07/2020/1084/O

Location:

Immediately adjacent to and North of 32 Bettys Hill Road Ballyholland Newry.

Proposal:

Site for 2 storey infill dwelling

Conclusion and Recommendation from Planning Official:

Refusal

Power-point presentation:

Mr Mark Keane, Senior Planning Officer gave a power point presentation via Teams on the application with supporting information including a site location plan, an aerial view of the site and photographs from various critical views of the site.

**Speaking rights:
(via Teams)**

In support:

Mr Anthony Mackle, agent and Mr Jim McQuillan, applicant presented in support of the application, detailing and expanding upon a written statement that had been circulated to Committee Members.

Issues raised:

- Planning did not consider the proposal represented an infill opportunity as it failed to meet the criteria of 3 or more buildings along a road frontage.
- Planning agreed that whilst visual linkage could be a consideration, it was not a determining factor.
- Planning agreed that buildings could be staggered or set back as long as they had frontage to the road, which they considered this proposal did not.
- Mr Mackle said the private lane served No. 30 Betty's Hill Road, which was the applicant's fathers home and the applicant owned all the land down to the roadside.
- Mr Mackle considered that 30 Betty's Hill Road had frontage on to the road, was visually linked and its set back location was more acceptable in rural settings as it minimised the urban effect.

Councillor Larkin proposed to issue an approval in respect of Planning Application LA07/2020/1084/O contrary to Officer recommendation on the basis that he considered it met the criteria of CTY 8 and No. 30 had frontage on to Bettys Hill Road. Councillor Hanna seconded the proposal.

The proposal was put to a vote by of roll call, and voting was as follows:

FOR: 7
AGAINST: 1
ABSTENTIONS: 2

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 LA07/2020/1084/O contrary to Officer recommendation on the basis No. 30 had frontage on to Betty's Hill Road and the proposal complied with CTY 8.

Planning Officers be delegated authority to impose any relevant conditions.

(Lunch Break: 13.15 – 13.50)

FOR NOTING

P/026/2021: HISTORIC ACTION SHEET

Read: Planning historic action sheet. **(Copy circulated)**

AGREED: It was unanimously agreed to note the Planning Historic Action Sheet.

**P/027/2021: PLANNING COMMITTEE PERFORMANCE REPORT
FEBRUARY 2021**

Read: Planning Committee Performance Report for February 2021.
(Copy circulated)

AGREED: It was unanimously agreed to note the Planning Committee Report for February 2021.

P/028/2021: PLANNING APPEALS AND DECISIONS

Read: Planning Appeals and Decisions Report for February 2021.
(Copy circulated)

AGREED: It was unanimously agreed to note the Report on Planning Appeals and Decisions for February 2021.

EXEMPT INFORMATION: LOCAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION

On the proposal of Councillor Trainor seconded by Councillor McAteer it was agreed to exclude the public and press from the meeting during discussion on the following items:

P/029/2021: LDP – PLANNING POLICY REVIEW – OVERVIEW

Read: Report dated 10 March 2021 from Mr A McKay, Chief Planning Officer regarding LDP: Planning Policy Review – Overview (copy circulated)

P/030/2021: LDP – PLANNING POLICY REVIEW – TRANSPORTATION

Read: Report dated 10 March 2021 from Mr A McKay, Chief Planning Officer regarding LDP: Planning Policy Review – Transportation (copy circulated)

P/031/2021: LDP – PLANNING POLICY REVIEW – FLOOR RISK AND DRAINAGE

Read: Report dated 10 March 2021 from Mr A McKay, Chief Planning Officer regarding LDP: Planning Policy Review – Floor Risk and Drainage (copy circulated)

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

When the Committee was out of closed session, the Chairman advised that the following had been agreed:

P/029/2021: LDP – PLANNING POLICY REVIEW – OVERVIEW

Agreed: On the proposal of Councillor McAteer, seconded by Councillor Trainor it was agreed that Planning Committee note the content of this report and the Local Development Plan: Planning Policy Review exercise which is being undertaken as part of the preparation of the draft Plan Strategy.

P/030/2021: LDP – PLANNING POLICY REVIEW – TRANSPORTATION

Agreed: On the proposal of Councillor O’Hare, seconded by Councillor Murphy it was agreed that the Planning Committee note ‘LDP: Planning Policy Review – Transportation’ and:

- **Agree the proposed draft planning policies for inclusion within the draft Plan Strategy, and**
- **Authorise the Development Plan Team to amend the proposed draft planning policies as necessary (i.e. subject of further consultation engagement, sustainability appraisal, and any change to overarching regional policy) and report back to Members any substantive changes to proposed policy wording or direction.**

P/031/2021: LDP – PLANNING POLICY REVIEW – FLOOR RISK AND DRAINAGE

- Agreed:** **On the proposal of Councillor McAteer, seconded by Councillor Murphy it was agreed that the Planning Committee note 'LDP: Planning Policy Review – Flood Risk and Drainage' and**
- **Agree the proposed draft planning policies for inclusion within the draft Plan Strategy, and**
 - **Authorise the Development Plan Team to amend the proposed draft planning policies as necessary (i.e. subject of further consultation engagement, sustainability appraisal, and any change to overarching regional policy) and report back to Members any substantive changes to proposed policy wording or direction**

The meeting concluded at 3.40pm.

For confirmation at the Planning Committee Meeting to be held on Thursday 8 April 2021.

Signed: _____ **Chairperson**

Signed: _____ **Chief Executive**