

[Redacted]

17/ December/2023

Following our (Moangarriff Residents) submission in Sept 2023 to the original Clonmel and Environs Development Plan, we note the Chief Executive's Report and the recommended changes. We welcome the opportunity to further comment on the report/changes, in particular in relation to the responses to our previous submission, numbered 85 in the Chief Executive's report. There are 3 specific items in this communication for which we request a response.

In our submission we had pointed out the zoning as documented in the draft LAP – Table 1 for sites 26 & 27. In particular we noted the assessment that the sustainable planning criteria are not met for either site (all x) and we disputed the scores on available infrastructure (roads, footpath etc).



Table 1: SLA for Lands available for new residential development

Site Details		Availability of Infrastructure at the site						Sustainable Planning Criteria applicable to the site					Category Score
Site Reference	Area (ha)	Roads	Footpath	Water	Cycle Lane	Public Lighting	Foul Sewer	Compact Growth	Walking analysis 5 - 10 mins	Walking Analysis 10 - 15 mins	Cycling Analysis 10 mins	Sequential	T1 / T2 / SR / Rezone
26	8.28	✓	✓	✓	✗	✓	✓	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	Part SR
27	18.40	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	SR

We note no changes to the scoring is recommended, that site 26 overall will remain part SR and 27 as SR; SR meaning “Long term strategic and sustainable development site – that may deliver housing in the subsequent development plan period, >6 years”. Part of site 26 is already existing residential (6 houses under construction), part is new residential (68 houses) and the remainder is designated SR.

**Request 1: Please comment on how can a site be zoned residential or SR if none of the ‘sustainable planning criteria’ are met** (i.e. all x) – It would appear ‘Sustainable Planning Criteria’ are not a priority in the considerations or having an insignificant impact on the overall scoring. We again state our position that the remainder of site 26 and site 27 should not be considered SR given that the sites meet none of the sustainable planning criteria and other factors.

In our original submission, we disputed the scores on available infrastructure (roads, footpath etc). We again dispute the safety/suitability of the Moangarriff road as a suitable road for increased traffic – you refer to the TIA completed by the developer and the fact that it was accepted by the Bord Inspector (in spite of errors and inconsistencies that we previously had pointed out). As the road users, we can indeed state that it is not safe or suitable for increased traffic – when there is an extra 120+ cars using this road to exit onto the Moangarriff roundabout (after 6+68 new houses added), we will unfortunately suffer the consequences.

**Request 2: You have failed totally to answer our questions relating to ‘How the road was deemed unsuitable and unsafe by you in the 2008 development plan and then changed to suitable in the 2013 development plan’.** There were your assessments stating ‘unsuitable’ one day with a recommendation in the 2008 plan that “future development west of Meadowlands be accessed off the Gurtnafleur Road.” The next day your view changed to ‘suitable and access allowed via Moangarriff Road’? **Please answer the questions - What changed to make it safe and suitable? Why were previous reports and the conclusions ignored?**

It seems strange that after adding a warehousing/industrial unit and a Petrol Station, the road has moved from “not suitable” to “suitable”!!

We again state our position that the wordings from the 2008 plan (unsuitability of Moangarriff Road and access via Gurtnafleur road) be reinstated in the new plan – This is even more important now than previously given the addition of an additional 74 houses.

We note the comment in the inspectors report in relation to areas on the Moangarriff roadway where *“improvements to pedestrian infrastructure is required to support new residential development and it is reasonable to state that these improvements can easily be delivered as part of development of the lands”*. We also note that the Draft LTP provides recommendations for “traffic calming and footpath upgrades along the Moangarriff Road connecting to the Meadowlands estate (Measure AT93 in Figure 6-17 of the LTP). This will improve safety for pedestrians and cyclists along this road”.

**Request 3: Please answer the question: Why do we have to wait *“as part of development”* for improvements.** The safety for pedestrians and cyclists is acknowledged here – so surely this should be done now, not later.



---

Joe Ryan

On Behalf of

Moangarriff Residents Planning  
Committee