LDP-PS-REP-38

Sarah-jayne Boyle

From: Sent: To: Subject: Attachments:	Paul McGarvey <paul@p4mcg.com> 27 January 2020 11:37 Planning Emailing: LDP 2032 submission LDP 2032 submission.pdf</paul@p4mcg.com>	
Please see the attached (3 page) submission in relation to the above.		36
Regards, Paul McGarvey RIBA 028 7131 3222 07724 999414		
Your message is ready to be sent with the following file or link attachments:		

LDP 2032 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.



paul mcgarvey architect

13a Ebrington Terrace, Londonderry, BT47 6JS (t) 028 7131 3222 (m) 07724 999414 (e) paul@p4mcg.com

Delly, DI40 / ININ

Dear Sir / Madam

Re: LDP 2032

RECEIVED 27 JAN 2020

36

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 Planning application is lodged to avoid further unregulated tree removal / mutilation and to support 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 'Building 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10(a); Page 267 HOU 21(c), Page 353 HE 4; Page 356 HE 5(a); Page 360 23.48; Page 361 23.52 are some examples) use the outdated and misleading requirement that any extensions to rural buildings / within Conservation Areas / to Historic Buildings "must be sympathetic to the scale,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).
- 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?

Paul McGarvey RIBA

paul mcgarvey architect



Date:

12th October 2009

Your Ref:

0732

Our Ref:

K/2009/0585/F

(Please quote at all times)

Mr P McGarvey P4mcg Architecture 13A Ebrington Terrace Londonderry BT47 6JS



Divisional Planning Office

County Hall Drumragh Avenue Omagh Co Tyrone BT79 7AF

Please contact: Miss K Coney Direct Line: NI Direct 101

Dear Mr McGarvey

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





