

— View selected questions



Barbara
McMinnis

MAIN QUESTION

Name:

Barbara McMinnis

+ ADD TO ANALYSIS

Address

97 Station Road

+ ADD TO ANALYSIS

Post Code

BT18 0BU

+ ADD TO ANALYSIS

Email

[REDACTED]

+ ADD TO ANALYSIS

Phone Number

+ ADD TO ANALYSIS

Are you responding as an individual?

Yes

+ ADD TO ANALYSIS

Are you responding on behalf of an organisation?

No

+ ADD TO ANALYSIS

Organisation and Job Title (if applicable):

No answer

+ ADD TO ANALYSIS

Are you an Agent responding on behalf of a client?

No

+ ADD TO ANALYSIS

Client Name , address (if applicable):

Barbara McMinnis

+ ADD TO ANALYSIS

+ ADD TO ANALYSIS

**Please indicate how you would like your representation to be dealt with at Independent Examination (please select one item only):
Please note that the Independent Examiner will be expected to give the same careful consideration to written representations as to those dealt with by oral hearing.**

Written (Choose this procedure to have your representation considered in written form only)



+ ADD TO ANALYSIS

Soundness of the Plan

Yes

+ ADD TO ANALYSIS

If you believe the strategy is unsound, please indicate which tests of soundness it fails and provide your reasoning below.

No answer

+ ADD TO ANALYSIS

Procedural Tests -

Yes

+ ADD TO ANALYSIS

Test P1 Comments

No answer

+ ADD TO ANALYSIS

+ ADD TO ANALYSIS

Test P2 Comments

No answer

+ ADD TO ANALYSIS

+ ADD TO ANALYSIS

Test P3 Comments

No answer

+ ADD TO ANALYSIS

+ ADD TO ANALYSIS

Test P4 Comments

No answer

+ ADD TO ANALYSIS

+ ADD TO ANALYSIS

Test C1 Comments

No answer

+ ADD TO ANALYSIS

+ ADD TO ANALYSIS

Test C2 Comments

No answer

+ ADD TO ANALYSIS

+ ADD TO ANALYSIS

Test C3 Comments

No answer

+ ADD TO ANALYSIS

+ ADD TO ANALYSIS

Test C4 Comments

No answer

+ ADD TO ANALYSIS

+ ADD TO ANALYSIS

Test CE 1 Comments

No answer

+ ADD TO ANALYSIS

+ ADD TO ANALYSIS

Test CE 2 Comments

No answer

+ ADD TO ANALYSIS

+ ADD TO ANALYSIS

Test CE 3 Comments

No answer

+ ADD TO ANALYSIS

+ ADD TO ANALYSIS

Test CE 4 Comments

No answer

+ ADD TO ANALYSIS

If you consider the draft Plan Strategy to be unsound please provide details of changes you suggest to make the draft Plan Strategy sound.

No answer

+ ADD TO ANALYSIS

Do you have any comments on the Implementation and Monitoring of the draft Plan Strategy?

No answer

+ ADD TO ANALYSIS

Sustainability Appraisal (SA) incorporating Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA)

No answer

NO ANSWER

+ ADD TO ANALYSIS

draft Habitats Regulations Assessment(HRA)

No answer

+ ADD TO ANALYSIS

Equality Impact Screening Report

No answer

+ ADD TO ANALYSIS

Rural Needs Impact Assessment

No answer

+ ADD TO ANALYSIS

Please add any additional comments

No answer

Example tag 1 +

Example tag 2 +

400m Stretch of North Down Coastal Path at Station Road, Craigavad

1. Public Safety and Urgency

The situation presents an urgent and ongoing risk to Coastal Path Users. Over the last 10 years 5 sink holes have appeared over this stretch. While modest in surface size, each conceals underlying voids of approx. 1.5m x 5m. These collapses appear where the toe-beam is missing indicating structural failure of the sea defence.

2. Council Engagement and Greenway Project

The CEO (Stephen Reid) encouraged residents to have Station Road 'oven ready' for transfer of ownership to the Council/NIEA in preparation for the Greenway Project. We were advised that our section would get priority due to its poor condition. All 16 frontage households signed an agreement to indicate willingness to transfer ownership. The Council holds this document.

3. Legal Position and Resident Investment

In 2014 the residents sought Legal Opinion on their responsibilities. It was confirmed that we are NOT responsible for maintenance on a PROW as it had been tested in court elsewhere in N.I. Nevertheless, in 2024, due to the unsafe condition of the pathway, residents funded resurfacing at a cost of £70,000.

4. Strategic Importance of the Route

This short stretch forms a vital link of the Ulster Way & North Down Coastal Path. Collapse would significantly disrupt the 1000's of public users.

5. Established Precedent

In 1992 The Council, NIEA and residents jointly funded improvements to the pathway and seawall at a total cost of £40,000 with residents contributing £5000. This demonstrated a clear precedent for shared responsibility.

6. Inequity of Coastal Protection

From Holywood to Seahill, most coastal sections benefit from established sea defences. We are not seeking preferential treatment but rather a long overdue correction to address neglect of this particular stretch.

7. Public Usage and Preventative Action

1000's of walkers and cyclists use this pathway annually. Its use is actively promoted by the council and other public bodies. It is therefore reasonable that these public bodies share responsibility for its protection. While the path surface is currently in good condition it is IMPERATIVE that the sea wall is reinforced. Preventative repair now is far more prudent than responding to a future collapse.

8. Legal Argument regarding Council Responsibility

In 2019 residents presented a legal argument to Stephen Reid, CEO of Council, that they had effectively created a "public pathway" when the road was resurfaced in 1992 and under **Article 13 of the Access to the Countryside Order (N.I.) 1983**. This could impose a legal duty on the Council to maintain the road. Mr Reid sought legal advice on this matter but refused to share the findings with residents.