

Administrative Officer
Large-scale Residential Developments
Planning & Development
Limerick City and County Council
Dooradoyle
Limerick

6th August 2026

Our Ref: CON24128

RE: APPLICATION REGISTER REFERENCE 26/60396: PERMISSION FOR A LARGE-SCALE RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT COMPRISING THE DEVELOPMENT OF 182NO. RESIDENTIAL UNITS AT A SITE AT THE MUNGRET LINK ROAD, CAHERANARDRISH, MUNGRET, CO. LIMERICK.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR FURTHER INFORMATION (RFI) DATED 29TH MAY 2026

Dear Sir/Madam,

We, Coakley O'Neill Town Planning Ltd. of NSC Campus, Mahon, Cork, are instructed by the applicants, Homeland Projects Ltd., to respond to the Planning Authority's Request for Further Information dated 5th May 2026 in respect to proposed development of a Large Scale Residential Development (LRD) at Caheranardrish, Mungret, Co. Limerick.

Further Information was requested in relation to 6no. items. Our response hereunder follows the format of the RFI:

1.

- a) ***Carry out and submit additional bat surveys over the summer months with an emphasis on the Lesser Horseshow Bat, through the use of static and manned surveys. The resulting report should contain measures designed to retain and enhance landscape features such as trees and hedgerows and a lighting plan to continue to allow movement of the Lesser Horseshoe Bat and other bat species across the development site and local landscape.***
- b) ***Carry out emergence surveys during the summer months at the three trees proposed for removal that were identified as having moderate roosting potential (T16, T17 and T20), and the results, together with a Regulation 54 derogation licence from NPWS if evidence of roosting bats is found, submitted as further information.***
- c) ***Two potential Barn Owl breeding sites have been identified to the east and west of the site respectively. It is recommended that the proposed buffer zone (currently 50m) within which no work will be carried out if breeding Barn Owls are confirmed, is increased to 100m (the upper limit of the NatureScot recommended range), according to the precautionary principle as advised in the same guidance. You are requested to submit information which confirms the***

Coakley O'Neill Town Planning Ltd.
Registered Office: NSC Campus, Mahon, Cork, Ireland
t +353(0)21 230 7000 f +353(0)21 2307070 e info@coakleyoneill.ie w www.coakleyoneill.ie

A Private Company Limited by Shares
VAT Reg. No.IE 9737006B Registered in Ireland No. 480 633 Directors: Dave Coakley, Aiden O'Neill

presence or absence of breeding barn owls and if necessary how the 100m no work buffer area will be implemented. This might be achieved by avoiding work in this area during the breeding season for instance.

d) The EclA shall be updated accordingly taking the above into account.

Response:

A Revised Ecological Impact Assessment has been prepared by Dixon Brosnan to address the queries raised in the Request for Further Information. The EclA should be read in conjunction with the updated IE Consulting Hydrology/Hydrogeology Report and the OSL Butler Engineering report/drawings.

Regarding the information requested by the Planning Authority, the following is a synopsis of Dixon Brosnan findings:

- a) Additional site visits were completed on the 15th of May 2026, 21st of May 2026, 25th of June 2026, 27th of June 2026, 3rd of July 2026, 16th of July 2026, 9th of July 2026 and 15th of July 2026.

Passive static data collected from May, June and July identified the following species utilising the site; Common Pipistrelle, Soprano Pipistrelle, Leisler's Bat, Lesser Horseshoe bat, an unidentified Pipistrelle species, an unidentified Myotis species, and Brown Long-eared bat.

Four records of Lesser Horseshoe bat, with 15 calls in total, were recorded throughout the May static surveys (15th to 21st of May). The data suggests overnight foraging activity but does not confirm a count of individual bats. No Lesser Horseshoe bat calls were recorded during the June statics. Fifteen recordings of Lesser Horseshoe bat, with a total of 41 calls, were recorded throughout the July statics. All Lesser Horseshoe bat activity recorded during July was recorded late in the night considerably after the dusk emergence window.

Throughout the 2026 survey period, Lesser Horseshoe activity was sporadic with calls recorded from 23:09 to 04:07. Call records are not indicative of bat emergence activity. Based on the recordings, Lesser Horseshoe bats appear to be utilising the proposed development site for sporadic foraging. It should be noted that although Lesser Horseshoe bat was recorded 19 times with 56 calls in total, this may not be an accurate depiction of the number of Lesser Horseshoe bat utilising the site. Foraging behaviour can cause repeat recordings of an individual bat.

One emergence event was recorded on the 25th of June from tree T20. As noted in the landscape plan and Table 8 of the EclA, this tree is proposed for retention. Trees T16 and T17 were surveyed and no emergence events were recorded. Two bat walkover surveys were conducted in June and July. These recorded a range of species including Common Pipistrelle, Soprano Pipistrelle and Leisler's Bat as well as occasional Myotis and Brown long-eared bats.

In regard to the requirement to provide further measures designed to retain and enhance landscape features such as trees and hedgerows and a lighting plan to continue to allow movement of the Lesser Horseshoe Bat and other bat species across the development site and local landscape, the EclA notes that the Lesser horseshoe bat activity recorded within the site was low, with no suitable roosting sites, no concentrated activity indicative of an important foraging area or regularly used commuting route.

While the internal hedgerow/treeline will be removed, the existing boundary treelines and hedgerows, which provide one of the suitable linear habitats for this species, will be retained and enhanced as outlined in the SRLA Tree Planting Plan.

The public lighting scheme has been redesigned to avoid direct illumination of boundary vegetation, with illuminance maintained below 1 lux and as close to existing background levels as practicable. Luminaires will be directional, fully shielded and of a warm colour temperature, with lighting confined to those areas where it is required. These measures will retain a continuous, sheltered, low-light corridor around the site. In view of the low level of recorded activity, retention of the principal foraging and commuting habitat and control of artificial light spill, the proposed development is not expected to result in a significant reduction in habitat availability or significantly increase habitat fragmentation for Lesser Horseshoe Bat.

The lighting plan has been designed to ensure there is no significant light spillage outside the site boundary. Lighting levels along retained ecological corridors will be designed to achieve minimal illumination (less than 1 lux), where feasible, in accordance with best practice guidance. Following the low number of Lesser Horseshoe records along the western site boundary, the lighting plan has been redesigned to further reduce light spillage along the western boundary and to retain dark corridors along boundary hedgerows and treelines. These measures will facilitate bat movement and avoid direct illumination of retained habitats, including hedgerows, treelines, and potential commuting routes. This includes avoiding lighting the area of retained woodland and the bat foraging habitat along the western site boundary.

An updated public lighting drawing, prepared by Molloy Consulting Engineers has been prepared to address the identified mitigation measures and is enclosed.

- b) Trees T16, T17 and T20 were identified in the RFI as trees proposed for removal. This was a typographical error in the EclA report. As outlined in the SRLA landscape plan, these trees will be retained. As such, there is no requirement to obtain a derogation license. The updated EclA has accounted for this update.
- c) As set out in Section 11.5.4 of the EclA a confirmed Barn Owl breeding site is located approximately 25m from the proposed development. It is noted that this area is screened from the development area by mature treelines, which will be retained and protected throughout construction works. The other potential Barn Owl site identified at Mungret College is located approximately 750m east of the proposed development. Given the substantial separation distance, the absence of any physical or functional connection to the proposed works and the fact that all construction activity will be confined to the application site, there is no credible pathway by which the proposed development could disturb, damage

or otherwise affect a Barn Owl breeding site at Mungret College. Confirmation of its current breeding status is therefore not required to inform the impact assessment or mitigation for the proposed development

In relation to the Barn Owl site nearer the proposed development, the updated EclA sets out a number of measures which will be implemented throughout construction works to avoid disturbance, displacement or abandonment of the breeding site, including the use of protection zones.

No potentially disturbing construction activity will be undertaken within 100m of the confirmed Barn Owl breeding site while the nest is active. The restriction will remain in place until a suitably experienced Barn Owl specialist confirms that breeding has concluded and any young are no longer dependent on the nest site.

The protection zones will be clearly identified on construction drawings and, where necessary, marked on the ground using temporary fencing or signage.

Fencing and signage will not be positioned in a manner that obstructs the nest entrance or established flight routes.

For further details on this, please refer to the enclosed updated EclA prepared by Dixon Brosnan.

- 2. *Submit a revised hydrogeological assessment report which clarifies in particular the basis for the mapped extent of groundwater supplying Loughmore Common Turlough from the north. In addition, the assessment should take into account any potential disturbance to the assumed south – north movement of groundwater (due to dewatering in the Mungret Quarry) as a result of existing development and infrastructure (including the Mungret Link Road) between the proposed development site and the quarry; and to examine any potential local influence on groundwater flow direction from the Loughmore Canal or the Barnakyle Stream which may alter the predicted flowpath.***

Response:

A revised Hydrological & Hydrogeological Assessment has been prepared by IE Consulting and is enclosed.

The Assessment addresses the basis for the mapped extent of the groundwater supplying the Turlough, accounts for any potential disturbances to the assumed movement of groundwater and examines any potential local influence on groundwater flow.

The baseline hydrological and hydrogeological understanding of Loughmore Common Turlough and the surrounding environs has been revised following the Request for Further Information. The revised assessment incorporates:

- a detailed delineation of the surface water catchment,
- an updated interpretation of groundwater flow directions based on available groundwater monitoring data,
- an assessment of potential disturbances to groundwater flow,
- an updated assessment of the stormwater management,
- and revised conceptual models describing the local and regional hydrological systems.

The proposed surface water management strategy has been designed to maintain the site's existing hydrological response by promoting infiltration at source through Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS), supplemented by attenuation storage where required. Consequently, the proposed development is not expected to result in a significant change to the quantity of surface water reaching the Turlough.

Potential sources of contamination, that might affect the water quality in the Turlough, will be effectively managed by the CEMP during construction and by the sealed and contained wastewater network, which will pump wastewater to the public foul sewer to the north.

For further detail please refer to the Hydrological & Hydrogeological Assessment has been prepared by IE Consulting, which accompanies this submission.

The Natura Impact Statement (NIS) has also been updated to address and reflect the findings and conclusions of the Hydrological & Hydrogeological Assessment.

- 3. *It is noted that it is proposed to discharge excess stormwater from the site to ground (at an existing discharge point), apparently in the vicinity of the Mungret Link Road. Please clarify that there is sufficient capacity in this outfall to discharge the additional loading without adversely affecting groundwater flow pattern or quality.***

Response:

The Surface Water Design of the proposed development has been revised in line with Item 5 of the Request for Further Information issued by the Planning Authority.

As a result, the surface water drainage design now omits the previously proposed surface water pumping station and associated emergency discharge of excess surface water at the existing discharge point (Mungret Link Road). Accordingly, the discharge arrangement referenced in Item 3 no longer forms part of the proposed development, and the capacity and groundwater-related matters raised under this item are therefore no longer applicable.

Please refer to the amended Surface Water Design Report and accompanying drawings prepared by OSL Butler Consulting Engineers which accompanies this submission for further detail.

- 4. The Planning Department are not satisfied with the Part V proposal. As such the applicant is requested to make contact with the Housing Department and following same shall submit a Letter of agreement.**

Response:

The applicant proposes to provide 38no. dwelling units to the Planning Authority to satisfy the 20% Part V requirement.

The Part V proposal includes 13no. 2-bed apartments and 25no. 1-bed apartments. A Part V Costing was prepared and submitted as part of the application.

The Part V proposal is in line with the proposal submitted in the applicants request for a 32B meeting with the Planning Authority, during which the Planning Authority was advised that the proposed Part V units were to be transferred to an Approved Housing Body.

The LRD Opinion issued by the Planning Authority on the 4th December under Section 32C of the Planning and Development Act requested the following in regard to Part V:

'The applicant is to provide information in respect of the Approved Housing Body that is proposed. Alternatively, the applicant should propose alternative units dispersed throughout the development'.

The LRD Opinion Response which was prepared on behalf of the applicant and submitted as part of the application set out that the applicant has engaged with Co-Operative Housing Ireland in respect to the Part V Units of the proposed development. A letter of intent from Co-Operative Housing Ireland was enclosed in the application.

Prior the submission of the application, the Housing Directorate of Limerick City Council was engaged to obtain a letter of principle agreement in regard to the Part V proposal. However, this was not forthcoming as the Housing Directorate advised that they were no longer satisfied with the proposal that had been put forward by the applicant and that the Affordable Housing Team required 18no. 3 bed units for affordable housing purposes.

As had been outlined at LRD Opinion Stage, the applicant had engaged with Co-Operative Housing Ireland in respect to the Part V Units of the proposed development however, on foot of the further feedback from the Limerick City and County Council Housing Directorate, the applicant has proposed to provide 13no. 2-bed apartment units and 5no. 1-bed apartment units to the Council for affordable housing.

In making planning applications, our clients' Part V proposals are finalised, as required, in accordance with Article 22(2)(e) of the Regulations, which states:

'(e) in the case of an application for permission for the development of houses or of houses and other development, to which section 96 of the Act applies, details as to how the applicant proposes to comply with a condition referred to in sub-section (2) of that section to which the permission, if granted, would be subject, including –

- (i) *details of such part or parts of the land which is subject to the application for permission or is or are specified by the Part V agreement, or houses situated on such aforementioned land or elsewhere in the planning authority's functional area proposed to be transferred to the planning authority, or details of houses situated on such aforementioned land or elsewhere in the planning authority's functional area proposed to be leased to the planning authority, or details of any combination of the foregoing, and*
- (ii) *details of the calculations and methodology for calculating values of land, site costs, normal construction and development costs and profit on those costs and other related costs such as an appropriate share of any common development works as required to comply with the provisions in Part V of the Act'.*

The relevant Departmental Guidelines, **Part V of the Planning and Development Act 2000** issued by the Minister for Housing, Planning, Community and Local Government in January 2017, are clear about the process involved in meeting Part V obligations.

The Guidelines make a distinction between the period prior to any grant of planning permission and post the grant of a planning permission, when a Part V agreement is to be made. At application stage, as there has been no decision to grant permission, no Part V agreement can be made and thus no evidence can be submitted confirming same.

Any request for evidence of an agreement at this stage, is contrary to both the relevant planning legislation and the statutory guidelines to which the Planning Authority must have due regard.

The process is set out in more detail in Circular PL 10/2015 and Housing Circular 36/2015 issued by the Department of Environment, Community and Local Government in November 2015. It states variously:

Only in the cases where an applicant fails to submit the required minimum detail as set out in the Appendix below should a planning authority invalidate the application on the grounds of non-compliance with Article 22(2)(e).

Planning authorities should ensure that staff members who are responsible for validating planning applications are familiar with the Guidance Note attached in Appendix A.

The amended Article 22(2)(e) now imposes specific requirements in relation to the details required to be submitted at planning application stage as to how the applicant proposes to comply with a Part V condition, if planning permission is granted. Where these details are not supplied, the planning application cannot be validated, in accordance with Article 26, as it fails to comply with Article 22.

There are three broad items that need to be included in a planning application regarding a Part V proposal, as follows:

1. *How the applicant intends to discharge his/her Part V obligation as regards a selection of a preferred option from the options available under legislation;*

2. *Details in relation to the units or land to be provided; and*
3. *Financial aspects.*

It is not realistic at planning application stage for an applicant to provide detailed actual costs for a development for which permission has not yet been granted, for which a detailed design has not yet been settled and for which site valuations are not required until the date of the grant of planning permission.

Once details of the Part V proposal are lodged with the planning application, this will commence the formal consideration of Part V issues for the development by the authority.

As Part V units are identified for transfer and calculations and methodology for calculating values of land, site costs, normal construction and development costs and profit on those costs and other related costs are submitted, our clients' applications fulfil the requirements for valid planning applications in respect of Part V under Article 22(2)(e).

Certainly, an agreement in principle can be reached at pre-planning stage or prior to a grant of permission. But it is clearly not a requirement of the Regulations and, often, is not appropriate.

The only requirement on an applicant prior to any grant of planning permission is to submit a Part V proposal in accordance with Article 22(2)(e).

The applicants have fulfilled this requirement and acted entirely in accordance with the relevant guidance and regulations.

Should a grant of permission be forthcoming the appropriate course of action will be to attach a condition to the planning permission requiring the applicants to enter into an agreement with the planning authority to fulfil their Part V obligations on the site. The applicants are happy to comply with any such condition and to engage with the Housing Directorate should a grant of permission be forthcoming.

Furthermore, the Planning Authority will be aware that developers are precluded from commencing development without having reached an agreement in relation to Part V.

In this, and all other, instances, the Planning Authority are in no way precluded from making a decision on this planning application in the absence of a Part V agreement or even an agreement in principle.

- 5. The proposed surface water pumping station shall be omitted in its entirety and in lieu of same, an enlarged surface water storage area or separate storage area shall be provided to fully compensate for the removal of same. The storage area shall be designed and constructed to be capable of accommodating emergency over-pumping by Limerick City and County Council through the installation of a temporary pump, thereby ensuring resilience within the surface water drainage system and preventing potential flooding events. This revised arrangement shall be supported by updated surface water drainage calculations and drawings, demonstrating that the proposed storage provision is sufficient to serve the development under all relevant design storm events.**

Response:

The proposed surface water pumping station has been omitted in its entirety, and the surface water drainage design has been revised accordingly. Additional attenuation and infiltration storage has been provided to accommodate all relevant design storm events without reliance on pumping or discharge to the public surface water network.

A dedicated stand-off manhole incorporating a sump is provided as a closed-ended emergency access point from which surface water may be temporarily over pumped by Limerick City and County Council, should this be required during an exceptional emergency. The stand-off manhole does not provide a permanent connection or routine discharge to the public surface water network and does not form part of the normal operation of the drainage system.

The design rationale, operational intent and details of the revised surface water drainage arrangement are set out under the following sections of this report. These are supported by revised drainage calculations and drawings demonstrating the adequacy and resilience of the proposed storage and drainage system.

For further detail, please refer to the enclosed updated Surface Water Design Report and accompanying drawings prepared by OSL Butler Consulting Engineers.

- 6. Submit a letter from Uisce Éireann confirming that the proposed foul water pumping station shall be taken in charge by them.**

Response:

A Statement of Design Acceptance (SODA) has been issued by Uisce Éireann relating to the proposed development on the 17th June 2026 (Connection Reference No: CDS25001670).

The SODA confirms that based on the information provided, which included the details of the proposed foul water pumping station, Uisce Éireann has no objection in regard to the proposal.

This Statement of Design Acceptance is enclosed with this submission.

Please find enclosed with this letter, the following:

- Surface Water Drainage Report and Drawings prepared by OSL-Butler Consulting Engineers;
- Statement of Design Acceptance issued by Uisce Éireann;
- Revised Hydrological & Hydrogeological Assessment prepared by IE Consulting;
- Revised Ecological Impact Assessment and Natura Impact Statement prepared by Dixon Brosnan Environmental Consultants; and
- Public Lighting Plan prepared by Molloy Consulting Engineers.

We trust everything is in order and look forward to a favourable decision in due course.

Please forward all correspondence in relation to this correspondence to this office.

Yours sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads 'Rory Hanrahan'.

Rory Hanrahan MPlan MIPI
Assistant Planner
Coakley O'Neill Town Planning Ltd.