## LOP. PS- REP- 107 (515 LOP. PS- REP- 38)

From:

Sent:

05 November 2020 14:29

To:

Local Development Plan

Subject:

Emailing: LDP 2032 GENERAL SUBMISSION

Attachments:

LDP 2032 GENERAL SUBMISSION pdf

Follow Up Flag:

Follow up

Flag Status:

Completed

LDP - General Submission

Please find attached my revised submission for the above.

Regards,



Your message is ready to be sent with the following file or link attachments:

LDP 2032 GENERAL SUBMISSION

Note: To protect against computer viruses, e-mail programs may prevent sending or receiving certain types of file attachments. Check your e-mail security settings to determine how attachments are handled.

1.00-09-02-107 (315 top-09-08-28)



## Londonderry, BT47 6JS

LOP-PS-REP-107 architect. (515LOP-PS-REP-38)

Your Ref: LDP 2032

5th November 2020

Planning LDP Team,
Derry City & Strabane District Council,
98 Strand Road,
Derry, BT48 7NN

HAND DELIVERED

Dear Sir / Madam

Re: LDP 2032

I request that the following points be considered regarding the Draft Local Development Plan 2032:

- There is currently no general protection for trees in the Countryside / Green Belt excepting when a remark of the country of the country of the current talks to increase tree numbers in rural N.I. (zero carbon proposals) a Tree Preservation Order (TPO) should be imposed throughout the Council Area (if not the Province). My belief is that this will come in time thus I suggest that Derry & Strabane should lead the way?
  - Rural policy proposals refer to 'High Quality' design ( Page 264 HOU 20 ) but this has rarely been
    enforced in reality clear reference should thus be made to the Department's own valuable
    publication 'Bullding on Tradition' throughout the LDP (e.g. insert into Page 247 16.95) to ensure
    that this desire becomes a requirement and not open to misinterpretation. There are far too many
    mediocre rural dwellings approved, leaving a dismal architectural legacy for future generations.
  - Several policies ( Page 245 HOU 10(a); Page 267 HOU 21(c), Page 353 HE 4; Page 356 HE 5(a); Page 360 23.48; Page 361 23.52 are some examples ) use the outdated and misleading requirement that any extensions to rural buildings / within Conservation Areas / to Historic Buildings "must be sympathetic to the scale, massing, architectural style and finishes to the existing building". This can be interpreted by Planners, Agents and Developers as meaning that only Pastiche will be approved and that good contemporary design will not. This is totally wrong as is clearly represented within the publication 'Building on Tradition' I attach documentation from one of our own applications proving that the Planner misinterpreted the wording, recommending Refusal ultimately approval was granted but only after we asked NIEA ( Buildings Branch ) to intervene they admired our contemporary approach good design should be of it's time. Thus the wording in these policies MUST change to remove such ambiguity ( as evidenced above ).
  - The Historic Environment Division similarly miss the opportunity to promote good modern design by
    virtue of their response Ref: REP-79-DfC stating that "extensions should be sympathetic to the
    scale, massing architectural style and finishes existing building".
  - Several policies ( Page 274 HOU 25; Page 273 HOU 24; Page 269 HOU 22 ); make reference to building in the Countryside with a footnote on how the policy differs in the Green Belt – surely ALL of the countryside, outside of designated Development Limits is within the Green Belt ( as dictated by PPS 21 ) and thus there is no difference between the Countryside and the Green Belt?



## ( 515 LOP-P5-R6P- 38)

Date:

12th October 2009

Your Ref:

0732

Our Ref:

K/2009/0585/F

(Please quote at all times)





## **Divisional Planning Office**

County Hall Drumragh Avenue Omagh Co Tyrone BT79 7AF

Please contact:

Direct Line:

NI Direct 101

Location:

150m west of 85 Castletown Road, Gortinagin, Omagh BT78 5RF

Proposal:

Proposed Barn conversion to dwelling plus rear extension plus garage

The Department is currently processing the above mentioned application. Before this proposal can be deemed acceptable the following design amendments are required in line with the policy provisions of CTY 4 of Draft PPS21:

Any new extension must be sympathetic to the scale, massing and architectural style and finishes of the existing building. The proposed rear extension, in particular, the curved roof, is neither sympathetic nor complimentary to the existing vernacular barn. Please amend the design of the rear extension so that it meets this policy criterion.

The applicant is also advised that the site is located within an area of identified flood risk and it is the responsibility of the applicant and his professional advisors to consider flood risk and mitigation at the application site. The applicant must demonstrate how they propose to make the development safe through design and flood resilient construction

Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any queries regarding any of the above.

Yours Sincerely



for Divisional Planning Manager







