

**From:** Planning  
**Sent:** 20 December 2018 11:40  
**To:** Development Plan  
**Cc:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Draft Strategy Plan Consultation Response - Personal response

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

---

**From:** Barry McNally (Councillor)  
**Sent:** Thursday, December 20, 2018 11:03 AM  
**To:** Planning  
**Subject:** Draft Strategy Plan Consultation Response - Personal response

To whom it may concern, please accept my comments below regarding the draft plan strategy as my personal feedback to the consultation, due to conclude tomorrow

Regards

Barry

**Ref: Housing Allocations – Needs Page 40**

I have concerns with the projected need of only 28 dwellings for Carrickmore town. When compared to other settlements in the area with town status 28 seems inadequate to meet demand to say the least. There is already a lack of development in terms of Housing in Carrickmore without restricting it further. I would like to see this number revised substantially upward. This has the ability to actually hinder the natural growth and development of Carrickmore

**Ref: Town centre boundary for Carrickmore (Page 106) -**

I would include the Church of Ireland and 4 buildings at lower main street into the town centre. Additionally, at the Drumnakilly road end of the town there are two large supermarkets, one of which sits just outside the town centre boundary and one which just sits inside the boundary. I would like to see both incorporated into the town boundary as between them they account for much of the commercial business of Carrickmore. I also would like to see the boundary extended on the Creggan road to, at least, the local chapel.

**Ref: Proposals under HU14 –**

The policy proposes that infill will be permitted if certain conditions are met. Part two of the policy outlines that:

*Infilling will be permitted within a line of buildings where the proposed site is a small gap suitable to accommodate only one dwelling within an otherwise substantial and continuously built up frontage which will not detract from the rural character. For the purposes of this policy, a substantial and continuously built up frontage is a line of at least 3 buildings, each with their own defined curtilage.*

I would be opposed reducing restricting the site size, which would only be suitable to accommodate one site, against the current policy (pps21 cty 8) which allows a maximum of 2 gap sites. I furthermore have an

issue with the need for each of the three buildings to have their own defined curtilage. This, in my opinion, is another way of saying the 3 buildings must be dwellings, its very unlikely a garage cited adjacent to a dwelling will have its own defined curtilage, separate from the dwelling.

**Ref: Proposals under DE06 –**

The Setting of Settlements – I disagree with the rigid nature of this policy with no room to assess each application of its own merits. My concern relates to lack of available development land within settlement limits. Even if there is available land it is often much more expensive due to its development potential but additionally the policy allows for no natural growth of settlements. It is very unlikely that over the span of several decades that a settlement will remain the same size and this policy seems to introduce a very rigid restriction for future development of settlements.

**Ref: Proposals under HOU01 –**

Housing in Settlements – I have concerns regarding the need for Housing Needs Assessments to be carried out regarding this. This also relates to other draft policies- for instance HOU03. In my experience HNAs are a poor indicator of need as it doesn't accurately reflect actual need in any given area, especially one of a rural nature.