



An
Bord
Pleanála

Record of Meeting ABP-305919-19

Case Reference / Description	344 no. residential units (212 no. houses & 132 no. apartments), creche and all associated site works. Clonminch, Clonminch Road (R443), Tullamore, Co. Offaly.		
Case Type	Section 5 Pre-Application Consultation Request		
Date:	6 th January 2020	Start Time	11:00 a.m.
Location	Offices of An Bord Pleanála	End Time	12:45 p.m.
Chairperson	Tom Rabbette	Executive Officer	Ciaran Hand

Representing An Bord Pleanála:

Tom Rabbette, Assistant Director of Planning
Joanna Kelly, Senior Planning Inspector
Ciaran Hand, Executive Officer

Representing Prospective Applicant:

Jan van Dijk, Van Dijk Architects
Brian McGurk, Van Dijk Architects
Stephen Ward, Stephen Ward Planning Consultants
Judith Horgan, Stephen Ward Planning Consultants
Andrew Bunbury, Park Hood Landscape Architects
Dan O' Reilly, DBFL Consulting Engineers
Brendan Keogh, DBFL Consulting Engineers
Kevin Maguire, Applicant

Representing Planning Authority

Gabriel Conlon, Administration
Andrew Murray, Senior Planner
Carroll Melia, Senior Executive Planner
Alaine Clarke, Executive Planner

Nick Smyth, Fire Services
Martin Quinn, Water
Pat Pilkington, Environment
John Connelly, Area Engineer
Monica Cleary, Senior Executive Officer – Housing
John Cunningham, Senior Executive Engineer – Housing
Jean Ryan, Senior Engineer – Roads
Willie Ryan, Senior Executive Engineer – Roads
ML Brophy, Area Engineer – Roads

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 12th December 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 15th November 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. Local Planning Policy provisions in respect of inter alia, Masterplans and phasing arrangements in respect of masterplan lands**
- 2. Development strategy for the site to include inter alia DMURS, layout, green infrastructure, urban design response.**
- 3. Surface water management to include comments in Planning Authority's opinion**
- 4. Traffic and Transportation to include consideration of comments in the planning authority's opinion**
- 5. Any other matters**

- 1. Local Planning Policy provisions in respect of inter alia, Masterplans and phasing arrangements in respect of masterplan lands**

ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:

- Masterplan provision and phasing as required by CDP
- Extent of engagement with other landowners
- Nodes and their inter-dependency if any
- Clarity as to what other masterplans for the nodes have been prepared to date
- The extent of concurrent infrastructure that is to be provided as part of the development having regard to specific objectives

Planning Authority's comments:

- The core strategy contains strict phasing with 25% of Phase 1 lands that could be developed by 2020
- Chapter 5 of CDP provides the details of the masterplan for the Tullamore Southern Environs Masterplan and the developers prepare the masterplan for each node
- This is first masterplan to be prepared in respect of the Tullamore Southern Environs
- Satisfied proposal accords with zoning
- Proposal includes encroachment onto phase three lands
- The issue of material contravention was raised in a section 247 meeting
- This is a peripheral location in terms of sequential development
- Enterprise node should be delivered before the residential
- There is provision for a road through the site
- Requirement to consult with Iarnród Éireann regarding a bridge over the railway
- Provision should be made for the bridge within the masterplan
- A special contribution could be sought in respect of bridge

Prospective Applicant's response:

- The masterplan for the node complies with zoning and the core strategy
- There is a school site and neighbourhood area reserved
- Discussions with the dept of education directly regarding these lands have not taken place
- Further discussions will take place
- Masterplan was given to all landowners and only one landowner has engaged
- Encroachment onto phase three lands is not a material contravention and justification for same was discussed at section 247 meeting.

- The development plan is flexible and allows for a sequential approach
- There is a housing need
- It's possible to stay within phase one lands
- Development as proposed which encroaches onto a small portion of the phase three lands will create a more complete development
- The enterprise node and residential node carry equal weight
- There is a permitted part 8 development and this development will be incorporated into the plans
- The road and bridge are a long-term objective

Further ABP comments:

- Need to justify the release of lands having regard to sequential approach and the encroachment onto phase 3 lands within the eastern node
- Clarity required as to what is being developed
- Consult with the department of education regarding school capacity
- Consider strategic layout of masterplan lands and how streets interface with neighbourhood lands
- Submit a rationale as to why a neighbourhood facility is not being provided in this phase
- Submit a phasing map and consider the interdependency if any of nodes within the overall masterplan
- Detail the nodal strategy
- Give consideration to creation of self-sustaining neighbourhoods within the node in absence of any further development
- Clarity if a special contribution is required in respect of bridge and full details will be required from PA re contribution.

2. Development strategy for the site to include inter alia DMURS, layout, green infrastructure, urban design response.

ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:

- Supporting documentation and how the development strategy supports self-sustaining neighbourhoods
- DMURS including street hierarchy and function in particular the indicative distributor road
- How proposal creates a sense of place, distinctive neighbourhoods
- Green infrastructure including open space hierarchy and functionality
- Qualitative nature of proposed urban design response including public realm
- How links over the bridge are to be provided in future

Planning Authority's comments:

- The indicative route was to be a distributor road
- Satisfied if it was to be a link road
- The route is indicative and terminates at the boundary which are in 3rd party lands
- Link streets are not estate roads
- DMURS allows for flexibility
- Could deliver more of the indicative road to the railway line
- A quality audit is required in respect of the link road

- The developer should examine links for the bridge location over the rail line
- There should be strategic linkages to open spaces
- A signalised junction at the entrance is welcomed and should be maintained

Prospective Applicant's response:

- The masterplan contains an indicative hierarchy for roads
- The route will be a link street and not a distributor road
- There are pedestrian and cycle linkages
- Proposed road is being delivered to the boundary of the applicant's lands
- There is a balance to be struck between road location and road alignment
- The links over the bridge will connect with Chancery lane into the future

Further ABP comments:

- Need to demonstrate how the development links to town centre in terms of sequential approach and that this is not a car dependent development
- Submit a rationale why this land is being developed at this time
- Address the feasibility of delivering the open space at Clonminch Woods
- Explain how the urban design contributes to the streetscape and consider concerns raised in the planning authority's opinion
- Create a quality streetscape and sense of enclosure to public realm
- Outline the quality of the public realm

3. Surface water management to include comments in Planning Authority's opinion

ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:

- SUDS, given concerns raised in planning authority's opinion
- Foul pumping station upgrades and concerns raised by planning authority regarding holding tanks

Planning Authority's comments:

- There is a lack of SUDS
- 4 attenuation tanks are being proposed
- Proposal to improve biodiversity should be examined
- The foul water network currently overloaded in heavy rainfall and the concerns regarding exacerbation of this issue

Prospective Applicant's response:

- There is a SUDS strategy which includes roof drainage and permeable paving
- The 1 in 30-year event is below ground and 1 in 100-year event above ground
- Biodiversity will be considered
- A pumping station is required

Further ABP comments:

- Provide details of infiltration tests
- No further information provision in SHD so need to ensure all technical details is provided
- Advised to consult further with the planning authority regarding this issue

4. Traffic and Transportation to include consideration of comments in the planning authority's opinion

ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:

- DMURS principles and how they have been incorporated into the scheme
- How proposal will deliver on transport objectives contained in the masterplan
- Provision for future public transport within the scheme

Planning Authority's comments:

- Traffic coming in/out of the town as a result of this development is a concern
- There needs to be pedestrian and cyclist connections
- Visitor parking should be considered

Prospective Applicant's response:

- The link road can be reconfigured
- A quality audit will be undertaken
- Car parking complies with national guidelines

5. Any Other Matters

ABP comments:

- Outline Part V costings
- Clarify the archaeology assessment and whether it extends to masterplan lands or the development site only
- NIS should consider in-combination effects
- EIAR to consider cumulative impact
- There is no further information sought at application stage

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
January, 2020