Outlook

## Re: Email Received

**From** Maria Taylor [redacted]
**Date** Thu 01/10/2026 12:02
**To** Local Development Plan <ldp@derrystrabane.com>

1 attachment (14 KB)
POP proposals.docx;

sorry though attachment had been added

maria

On Thu, Oct 1, 2026 at 11:23 M Local Development Plan <ldp@derrystrabane.com> wrote:

> Good morning,
>
> Further to the received email below, it is noted that there is no content.
>
> Regards,
>
> Aaron McKeever

---

**From:** Maria Taylor <[redacted]
**Sent:** 30 September 2026 22:41
**To:** Local Development Plan <ldp@derrystrabane.com>
**Subject:**

Maria Taylor-Kirk

MBPsS, MNCP(accred)

**Disclaimer**

The information contained in this communication from the sender is confidential. It is intended solely for use by the recipient and others authorized to receive it. If you are not the recipient, you are hereby notified that any disclosure, copying, distribution or taking action in relation of the contents of this information is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful.

This email has been scanned for viruses and malware, and may have been automatically archived by **Mimecast Ltd** , an innovator in Software as a Service (SaaS) for business. Providing a **safer** and **more useful** place for your human generated data. Specializing in; Security, archiving and compliance. To find out more Click Here.

--
Maria Taylor-Kirk
MBPsS, MNCP(accred)

Council Preferred Option Our Preferred Option

4.3 Percentage Cap Option 1: 10% cap during transition period and 10% outside future HMO Management Areas. Option 1: Fully support. 10% is recognised as a tipping point above which communities are adversely affected. 10% still allows for HMO development distributed in a more equitable way. The evidence on which the council proposed 30% is now recognised as out of date and inaccurate (EVB 16b).

4.4 HMO Management Areas Option 2: Designate HMO Management Areas where up to 30% HMOs would be permitted. Option 1: 10% everywhere We believe 10% should apply everywhere in the city and district. This is fair to everyone who lives here. A 10% threshold coupled with other forms of accommodation including PBSA can satisfy housing demand.

4.5 Concentration / Sandwiching Option 3: Anti-sandwiching and adjoining-HMO controls, without a radius test. Option 2: Bristol-style approach. This option introduces anti-clustering and anti-sandwiching protections, and considers the impact of HMO in adjoining streets. This approach provides a clearer and quantifiable method for calculating HMO density.

4.6 Definition of Dwelling Units / Houses Option 2: Exclude flats/apartments, blocks of flats and short-term lets from the denominator. Option 3: exclude flats/apartments ≤150$m^2$, short-term lets, NIHE/HA dwellings, etc. This option better records the impact on residential communities of ALL types of transient housing which have the same impact as HMO (such as holiday lets or emergency housing).

4.7 Definition of Street / Area Option 2: Consider adjacent and nearby streets using professional judgement. Option 3: Defined radius or wider area assessment. Similar to 4.5 option 3 gives a 10% HMO cap across the city and district. Option 3 introduces a 50m boundary that prevents reliance by planners on ‘professional judgement’ or the use of ambiguous terminology, for example ‘nearby’ and ‘adjoining’ as a way of calculating HMO numbers