



Case Description	212 no. residential units (156 houses and 56 apartments), a creche and all associated site development works. Moneyduff, Oranmore, Galway.		
Case Type	Section 5 Pre-Application Consultation Request		
1st Meeting	1 st Meeting		
Date:	8 th February, 2019	Start Time	11:30 a.m.
Location	Offices of Galway County Council	End Time	13:20 p.m.
Chairperson	Tom Rabbette	Executive Officer	Ciaran Hand

Representing An Bord Pleanála:

Tom Rabbette, Assistant Director of Planning
Stephen Rhys Thomas, Planning Inspector
Ciaran Hand, Executive Officer

Representing Prospective Applicant:

Paul Fitzmaurice, Applicant representative
Blair Stanaway, Architect
Brendan Rudden, Engineer
David McNicholas, Ecologist
Pamela Harty, Planner
Pat Roberts, Ecologist

Representing Planning Authority

Valerie Loughnane, Senior Planner
Eileen Keaveney, Administrative Officer
Kevin Finn, Acting Senior Executive Engineer
Daithi Flood, Assistant Engineer

Introduction

The representatives of An Bord Pleanála (ABP) welcomed the prospective applicant, Planning Authority (PA) and introductions were made. The procedural matters relating to the meeting were as follows:

- The written record will be placed on the pre-application consultation file and will be made public, along with that file, should an application arise following the conclusion of this consultation process,
- ABP received a submission from the PA on 24th January 2019 providing the records of consultations held pursuant to section 247 and its written opinion of considerations related to proper planning and sustainable development that may have a bearing on ABP's decision,
- The consultation meeting will not involve a merits-based assessment of the proposed development,
- The meeting will focus on key site-specific issues at strategic overview level, and whether the documents submitted require further consideration and/or amendment in order to constitute a reasonable basis for an application.
- Key considerations will be examined in the context of the statutory development plan for the area and section 28 Ministerial Guidelines where relevant,
- A reminder that neither the holding of a consultation or the forming of an opinion shall prejudice ABP or the PA concerned in relation to any other of their respective functions under the Planning Acts or any other enactments and cannot be relied upon in the formal planning process or in legal proceedings.

The ABP representatives acknowledged the letter dated 20th December 2018 formally requesting pre-application consultations with ABP. Prospective applicant advised of the need to comply with definition of SHD as set out in the Act of 2016, in relation to thresholds of development. It was also noted that the Inspector dealing with the pre-application consultation request would be different to who would deal with the application when it was submitted. Recording of the meeting is prohibited.

Agenda

- 1. Natural Heritage and Ecology. NIS and EIAR.**
- 2. Archaeological and Cultural Heritage.**
- 3. Pedestrian permeability and DMURS.**
- 4. Any other matters.**

NOTE:

At the commencement of the meeting, correspondence from the Development Applications Unit of the Department of Culture, Heritage and the Gaeltacht, in relation to Nature Conservation was referred to by representatives of the Board. The correspondence had not been forwarded to the prospective applicant and the meeting was adjourned for a short period to allow time for its contents to be read.

1. Natural Heritage and Ecology. NIS and EIAR.

ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:

- National Parks and Wildlife Service submission on this proposed development and the contents of the NIS generally.

Prospective Applicant's response:

- This proposed development is outside of the SAC boundary and is not encroaching
- Mitigation measures have been included to manage potential run off during the construction phase
- Flood risk will be examined and addressed in the NIS at application stage
- There has been an increase in the human population of the wider area and no residential developments are linked to Cregganna Marsh
- A landscaping buffer will be provided to the adjacent SAC
- There is no evidence to show an ancillary feeding area in the SAC
- There are no open water or mud flats east of the public road
- A full winters worth of survey data will address what bird species utilise the SAC (if any)
- An otter survey will also be submitted
- The SPA is 200 meters in proximity from the site, a permitted development of 400 houses and a wide public road form a barrier to Cregganna Marsh
- It will be demonstrated that the SPA is not being used for geese, the site cover is scrub and not a wetland, the SPA also contains dense rushes and reeds
- No birds of note are located in the adjacent area of the SAC
- Annex 1 Habitat is not being lost
- The concerns outlined in the National Parks and Wildlife Service submission will be addressed

Planning Authority's comments:

- Examine the SEA of 2012 Oranmore LAP
- There was flooding in Galway in 2015
- Prove that there is no flood impact
- Meet all of the objectives of the LAP
- Use information and data to back up statements
- Address all concerns contained in the National Parks and Wildlife Service submission

Further ABP comments:

- Ensure all concerns contained in the National Parks and Wildlife Service submission are addressed
- Examine if there are any in-combination effects with other existing and permitted developments, as necessary
- Use scientific data and analysis to support your bird survey
- Clarify if any impact from leisure use such as cyclists and dog walkers will result to the SAC
- Ensure that all conclusions are beyond reasonable scientific doubt

- Address hydraulic connections, habitats and species impact and cumulative impact
- Highlight if there is any human impact
- Ensure that the EIAR ties in with the NIS regarding baseline data

2. Archaeological and Cultural Heritage.

ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:

- Archaeological and Cultural Heritage in the context of the Development Applications Unit submission
- Visual amenity of the Castle a Recorded Monument (GA095-084)

Prospective Applicant's response:

- Satisfied with the DAU submission
- Mitigation measures will be taken and the buffer area of 20 meters can happen
- Happy with the proposed conditions in the event of the application being granted
- In considering the Castle the landscaping plan is sensitive
- The buffer area around the Castle is sensitively managed
- It can be addressed how certain areas might be taken in charge
- A management company would be used

Planning Authority's comments:

- No issues with management of the buffer area around the Castle

Further ABP comments:

- Address concerns raised in the Development Applications Unit submission
- Clarify if open space around the castle remains are to be taken in charge

3. Pedestrian permeability and DMURS.

ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:

- The distributor road in connection with other developments
- DMURS context
- The permitted roundabout provides an ideal solution for vehicles but what proposals are there with regards to pedestrians and cyclists

Prospective Applicant's response:

- Permeability increases from Oranmore to the town centre
- There is an existing permission on the adjacent site
- An agreement is in place with another landowner to construct a road which will be pedestrian and cyclist friendly
- There is a marginal adjustment required for lanes at the roundabout
- Pre-development submissions have been lodged, conditions have been met and commencement notices have been issued
- There is a discharging condition
- There is a pathway on 3rd party land which is not taken in charge

Planning Authority's comments:

- In 2015 there was a previous road permission this was prior DMURS
- A condition included that requires agreement on a phased basis
- Phase 1 is the roads process
- The roundabout will have minor amendments which will comply with DMURS and the cycle strategy without changing the road
- The long-term plan is to have a road to N18
- Roads in the area are not taken in charge

Further ABP comments:

- Address all conditions outlined at application stage
- Provide a detailed DMURS design statement
- Pedestrian connections require greater detail

4. Any other matters

ABP comments:

- Have regard to the recent planning history of this site
- Have regard to the new EIAR regulations

Prospective Applicant's response:

- Creche spaces have been increased on foot of comments in the Inspector's Report

Planning Authority's comments:

- Further discussions can take place with the prospective applicant regarding any outstanding issues

Conclusions

The representatives of ABP emphasised the following:

- There should be no delay in making the planning application once the public notice has been published
- Sample notices, application form and procedures are available on the ABP website
- Irish Water would like prospective applicants to contact Irish Water at cdsdesignqa@water.ie **between the Pre-Application Consultation and Application stages**, to confirm details of their proposed development and their proposed design.
- The email address to which applicants should send their **applications** to Irish Water as a prescribed body is spatialplanning@water.ie

Tom Rabbette
Assistant Director of Planning
February 2019