

Section 3.4.1

Compliance with National and Regional Population Targets.

I wish to register my disappointment with the unambitious targets under table 3.2 for County Donegal generally 2016 - 2026 - 2031.

This increase in population is insufficient, in my opinion, to ensure a strong vibrant population particularly outside the Limerick, Shannon Ennis axis.

Rural areas, small towns & villages need greater room for development and population increase than that allowed for in the projections.

Our County Development Plan must reflect greater support for these areas with the ambition that the need for housing & wish by so many people to return to live in County Donegal post pandemic will result in an increase in the population projections from the National Development Plan during the life time of the County Development Plan.

Thanking you

Mlle. Joe Kelleher



a projected increase in Uilleann Mairbhay of 43 units (2)
is unreasonable as is an increase in Rísdoonvarna
of ~~44~~ 44 units (85 people). A projection of
37 units = 63 people and Rís ferasas 13 units
and 25 people is simply insufficient to allow
growth to take place and meet the need of
our house hunting population.

Ballyvaughan with 15 units = 29 people will, as other
villages are, be staved of the numbers needed to regenerate,
sustain itself and ensure services are kept in place such
as schools, post offices,
fonda stations, health centres etc etc.

Mrs Joe Kilbren

I seek a relaxation of the rules reflected in CDP 4.14 New Single Houses in the Countryside particularly restrictions around ~~heritage~~ site abutting Scenic Routes.

My area, North Here, is a tourist hot spot which is most welcome.

However the restrictions around planning on sites adjacent to scenic routes is causing hardship for those who own the property along these routes and who's family wish to build a house or live in these lands.

Considerations around Heritage Landscapes and now proximity to scenic routes makes it ~~high~~ ^{high} ~~and~~ more difficult to get planning which is leading to a devaluing of the population in these areas with the consequent reduction in school ^{going} ~~going~~ pupils, supportive rural communities and an overall reduction in the population in huge swathes of North & West Here.

Clk. Joe Kellan

My observation on CPD 4.14 Economic Need -

This section seeks to suggest that only those who have an economic or social need should reside in Rural Core. This seeks to restrict those who will qualify - further reduce the population of Rural Core.

The presumption that one does not qualify until one can prove otherwise is a detrimental step and will cause hardship for members of farm families and those who, by choice, wish to reside in a rural area.

The 10 Hectare rule must be seen as a yardstick to confirm qualification while the absence of 10 Hectares must not be seen as a yardstick for refusal of permission.

Like wise 10 years residency in an area is a very high bar to reach, too high in my opinion and should be much lower.

Ulla Jo Kellan.