



An
Bord
Pleanála

Record of Meeting

ABP-303843-19

Description	138 no. residential units, 24 no. 'step down/independent living' units and associated site works. Crann Ard Estate, Fethard Road, Clonmel, Co. Tipperary.		
Case Type	Section 5 Pre-Application Consultation Request		
Date:	12 th April 2019	Start Time	11:30 a.m.
Location	Offices of Tipperary County Council (Clonmel)	End Time	12:55 p.m.
Chairperson	Tom Rabbette	E.O.	Ciaran Hand

Representing An Bord Pleanála:

Tom Rabbette, Assistant Director of Planning
Lorraine Dockery, Senior Planning Inspector
Ciaran Hand, Executive Officer

Representing Prospective Applicant:

Stephen M. Purcell, Future Analytics Consulting Ltd – Planning Consultant
Jan van Dijk, van Dijk Architects – Project Architect
Gary Barron, Duffy Consulting Engineers – Project Engineer
Andrew Griffith – Crann Ard Developments Ltd. (applicant)

Representing Planning Authority

Caroline Conway, Senior Executive Planner
Jonathan Flood, District Planner
James Murray, Senior Executive Planner with Responsibility for Taken in Charge
Oliver Tierney, Senior Executive Planner
John Fogarty, Executive 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 26th March 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 27th February 2019 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. Procedural issues**
- 2. Development Strategy in relation to layout, density, open space provision, elevational treatment, childcare provision**
- 3. Residential amenity**
- 4. Traffic and Transportation**
- 5. Drainage**
- 6. Archaeology**
- 7. Any other matters**

1. Procedural Issues

ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:

- Red line and blue line boundary
- Access to plots using existing roads
- Are the roads taken in charge?

- Vehicular connections
- Carparking
- Status of the strip of land north of Plot C

Planning Authority's comments:

- Generally, the authority is satisfied with the development
- Favour a single red line connecting the 3 plots

Prospective Applicant's response:

- Roads are not taken in charge
- Possible to have them taken in
- Road connections will be shown at application stage
- All roads are in the ownership of the applicant
- There is a site resolution plan
- The P.A. requested all 3 plots within a single red line boundary
- Drawings will show carparking
- Planning history of the site will be submitted
- Land north of Plot C is reserved as a buffer
- Future proposals for this land will be outlined at application stage

Further ABP comments:

- Clarify the red line and blue line boundary
- Outline road ownerships within overall development, all associated areas in applicant's ownership should be included within the blue line boundary at application stage
- Clarify car parking and access arrangements on land to the south of block B, drawings lack clarity
- Detail the planning history of the site
- Outline the future proposals for the land north of Plot C
- Detail the status of the land north of Plot C
- Possible to have 3 separate plots forming the application site, access arrangements to all sites should be clear, such access should be within the red line or blue line boundaries on the submitted drawings

2. Development Strategy in relation to layout, density, open space provision, elevational treatment, childcare provision

ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:

- Layout of Plot C
- The road cutting through the open space
- Density proposed
- Usability of open space
- Elevational treatment
- If there is provision for childcare

Prospective Applicant's response:

- The P.A was keen on 15% open space provision

- The density being proposed will be re-examined
- LAP states a separation distance of 4 meters between sides/gables of dwellings
- The distance can be reduced
- Roads have sufficient capacity to deal with this proposed development
- There is attenuation on Plot B
- Clarified proposals around the pumping station
- Material used for the elevational treatment is high quality and maintenance free
- Entrance walls will be made of stone
- There is no provision for childcare
- At present there are significant number of childcare providers in the area

Planning Authority's comments:

- No issues with Plot C
- Have regard to the gradient of the site
- Satisfied that the proposed development respects the character of the area
- No reservations with density
- Plot B has the highest density
- The density could impact on the roads (N24) and roundabouts having regard to the associated trip generation
- Higher density means more pressure on roads
- Plot B is viewed as an infill/residual
- Density of Plot B is a concern
- Ensure that in the treatment of plot a – entrance walls will be stone and that they blend into the area
- Childcare is not an issue

Further ABP comments:

- Have regard to the s.28 Sustainable Residential Development Guidelines, the associated Urban Design Manual and DMURS in site layout and development strategy
- Look to creating more tighter pockets of open space, greater sense of enclosure to proposed areas of open space
- Submit a plan outlining how all open space can be utilised
- Differentiate between active and passive space
- Examine the density and have regard to Clonmel being a key town
- Unit typology could be examined
- Address any potential traffic congestion
- Provide contiguous elevations of existing and proposed dwellings in plot B
- Provide cross sections throughout the site and CGI's
- Address the usability of the open space in Plot B
- Ensure a high quality of elevational treatment
- Submit a justification for why there is no childcare provision
- List providers and childcare capacity
- The blue line could include roads and open space
- The red line could include all access points

3. Residential Amenity

ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:

- Usability of gardens for Plot B

Prospective Applicant's response:

- All issues raised will be addressed

Planning Authority's comments:

- There are issues with the usability of rear gardens for Plot B
- Build-up of gardens is required

Further ABP comments:

- Look to amenities for existing occupants
- Address overlooking, overshadowing, noise, and access to daylight and sunlight
- Provide contiguous elevations where appropriate indicating integration of proposed dwellings with existing dwellings in the development
- Examine the ground level differences and assess the impact on usability of gardens, propose mitigation as appropriate

4. Traffic and Transportation

ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:

- Traffic impact of the proposed development

Prospective Applicant's response:

- The road network has the capacity to serve the proposed development
- A priority junction could be provided

Planning Authority's comments:

- No issue with the proposed development *per se*
- The concerns relate to increased densities, precedent this would set and capacity of road network to accommodate such proposals
- The precedent of higher density will lead to more traffic
- Capacity at the roundabout is a concern

Further ABP comments:

- Outline how/if the road network can accommodate this development
- There is no further information sought at application stage
- Address the P.A concerns regarding the potential of roundabout queuing and impacts arising

5. Drainage

ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:

- Pumping station

Prospective Applicant's response:

- Satisfied with proposal and gravity connections

Planning Authority's comments:

- There is no decommissioning of the pumping station
- It currently serves existing houses (10 houses)
- All new connections will be part of a gravity system

Further ABP comments:

- Address any drainage and surface water concerns

6. Archaeology

ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:

- Impact of the proposed development on any archaeology

Prospective Applicant's response:

- There are no recorded monuments

Planning Authority's comments:

- No comment

Further ABP comments:

- Submit an impact assessment at application stage
- Contact the DAU

7. Any other matters

ABP comments:

- Outline a proposed phasing plan
- Submit a schedule of floor areas, tree and hedgerow survey, ecology survey and waste management assessment
- Ensure compliance with Part V
- Any possible future connections- adjoining lands, should be brought up to the boundary, potential of 'ransom strips' should be avoided

Planning Authority's comments:

- Plot A and B should be closed off prior to work on Plot C
- Need to avoid an expansive construction site
- Concerns that sites can be commenced and left uncompleted
- A taken in charge map should be submitted

Applicants Comments:

- It's difficult to close off one plot prior completely before commencing on the next
- A level of phasing could be possible
- A taken in charge map can be submitted

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
- Proposed development must be specifically described in public notices as build to rent housing for long-term rental housing
- 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

April 2019