

Owen Shinkwin

From: Jeremy Ward <jeremy_ward@corkcity.ie>
Sent: 03 August 2012 18:09
To: Owen Shinkwin
Subject: Mahon
Attachments: image003.wmz

Liz K / Gerry B are out all of that week [just confirmed]. Are you and Dave free at all w/c 3/9? Please confirm. Thanks

Regards

Jeremy Ward
Acting / Senior Planner

Planning Policy Section
Strategic Planning + Economic Development Directorate,
Cork City Council, City Hall, Cork

T: 021-492-4450
F: 021-492-4712
E: jeremy_ward@corkcity.ie
I: www.corkcity.ie



Cork City Heritage Open Day
Saturday, 18th August 2012

www.corkheritageopenday.ie

Owen Shinkwin

From: Jeremy Ward <jeremy_ward@corkcity.ie>
Sent: 25 July 2012 12:58
To: Owen Shinkwin
Subject: Mahon LAP

Hi Owen

I hope that you are well.

I am just sending a quick email to make contact with you regarding setting up a meeting regarding the above / N40 between the Cork City Council, the NTA and the NRA. Please give me a call on the number below when you get a moment [I don't have your direct number].

Many thanks

Regards

Jeremy Ward
Acting / Senior Planner

Planning Policy Section
Strategic Planning + Economic Development Directorate,
Cork City Council, City Hall, Cork

T: 021-492-4450
F: 021-492-4712
E: jeremy_ward@corkcity.ie
I: www.corkcity.ie

Owen Shinkwin

From: Jeremy Ward <jeremy_ward@corkcity.ie>
Sent: 03 August 2012 17:34
To: Owen Shinkwin
Subject: Mahon meeting
Attachments: image001.wmz

Hi Owen

Just trying to arrange this meeting....sorry it's taking a while. Does Wednesday 15th August PM suit you and your colleagues for a meeting?

Hopefully we can fix the meeting on Tuesday and I can email the doc out to you after that. Have a good weekend.

Please get back to me at your earliest convenience.

Regards

Jeremy Ward
Acting / Senior Planner

Planning Policy Section
Strategic Planning + Economic Development Directorate,
Cork City Council, City Hall, Cork

T: 021-492-4450
F: 021-492-4712
E: jeremy_ward@corkcity.ie
I: www.corkcity.ie



Cork City Heritage Open Day
Saturday, 18th August 2012

www.corkheritageopenday.ie

Owen Shinkwin

From: Jeremy Ward <jeremy_ward@corkcity.ie>
Sent: 02 August 2012 12:37
To: Tara Spain (tspain@nra.ie)
Cc: Elizabeth Kidney; Paul Moran (pmoran@nra.ie); rbowen@nra.ie; Noel Tummon; Owen Shinkwin
Subject: Mahon Strategic Transport and Traffic Assessment / Mahon LAP
Attachments: image001.wmz

Dear Tara

Further to our previous conversation [on 7 June 2012] regarding progress on the proposed Mahon LAP I am now in a position to confirm that the *Mahon Strategic Transport and Traffic Assessment* has now been completed and that the City Council would like to invite the NRA and NTA, as key transport stakeholders, to a meeting to:

- Review the outcome from the transport assessment; and
- Review the sketch preliminary area wide strategy that will form the basis for the Local Area Plan.

I will try to call you this afternoon to establish the availability of you and your colleagues for such a meeting. We are looking at holding the meeting in the week commencing 20/8 but if this doesn't suit then we can review this to accommodate you and your colleagues.

I look forward very much to your involvement at the proposed meeting.

Regards

Jeremy Ward
Acting / Senior Planner

Planning Policy Section
Strategic Planning + Economic Development Directorate,
Cork City Council, City Hall, Cork

T: 021-492-4450
F: 021-492-4712
E: jeremy_ward@corkcity.ie
I: www.corkcity.ie



Cork City Heritage Open Day
Saturday, 18th August 2012

www.corkheritageopenday.ie

Owen Shinkwin

From: Jeremy Ward <jeremy_ward@corkcity.ie>
Sent: 03 August 2012 18:33
To: Owen Shinkwin
Subject: RE: Mahon
Attachments: image003.wmz; image005.wmz

Owen

OK. I'll aim for that. Is any day better for you? Wednesday??
[I don't normally work this late on a Friday...hope to go in the next 5].

Have a good one.

Regards

Jeremy Ward
Acting / Senior Planner

Planning Policy Section
Strategic Planning + Economic Development Directorate,
Cork City Council, City Hall, Cork

T: 021-492-4450
F: 021-492-4712
E: jeremy_ward@corkcity.ie
I: www.corkcity.ie



Cork City Heritage Open Day
Saturday, 18th August 2012

www.corkheritageopenday.ie

From: Owen Shinkwin [<mailto:owen@nationaltransport.ie>]
Sent: 03 August 2012 18:20
To: Jeremy Ward
Subject: RE: Mahon

Jeremy,

I'm actually out all of that week but will be back on 10th. If it's not too late for you, my preference would therefore be for the week commencing 10th Sep.
David is also available that week.

Regards,

Owen

From: Jeremy Ward [mailto:jeremy_ward@corkcity.ie]
Sent: 03 August 2012 18:09

To: Owen Shinkwin
Subject: Mahon

Liz K / Gerry B are out all of that week [just confirmed]. Are you and Dave free at all w/c 3/9? Please confirm. Thanks

Regards

Jeremy Ward
Acting / Senior Planner

Planning Policy Section
Strategic Planning + Economic Development Directorate,
Cork City Council, City Hall, Cork

T: 021-492-4450
F: 021-492-4712
E: jeremy_ward@corkcity.ie
I: www.corkcity.ie



Cork City Heritage Open Day
Saturday, 18th August 2012

www.corkheritageopenday.ie

Owen Shinkwin

From: Jeremy Ward <jeremy_ward@corkcity.ie>
Sent: 07 August 2012 11:03
To: Owen Shinkwin
Subject: RE: Mahon
Attachments: image003.wmz; image005.wmz

Perfect. I think that we have a date that suits everybody. I will double-check internally and then confirm later on this morning. Thanks for your quick response.

Jeremy

Regards

Jeremy Ward
Acting / Senior Planner

Planning Policy Section
Strategic Planning + Economic Development Directorate,
Cork City Council, City Hall, Cork

T: 021-492-4450
F: 021-492-4712
E: jeremy_ward@corkcity.ie
I: www.corkcity.ie



Cork City Heritage Open Day
Saturday, 18th August 2012

www.corkheritageopenday.ie

From: Owen Shinkwin [<mailto:owen@nationaltransport.ie>]
Sent: 07 August 2012 11:00
To: Jeremy Ward
Subject: RE: Mahon

Jeremy,

Yes, we are both attending the same meeting in County Hall that morning, so 2.30 in City Hall would be fine.

Regards,
Owen

From: Jeremy Ward [mailto:jeremy_ward@corkcity.ie]
Sent: 07 August 2012 10:54
To: Owen Shinkwin
Subject: RE: Mahon

Owen

I was just talking to Tara Spain. She suggested that you are down on the 12th with the county about Ringaskiddy [between 11-1]. Does that mean that you [and colleagues] are free from 2.30pm-4pm to meet us about Mahon?

Regards

Jeremy Ward
Acting / Senior Planner

Planning Policy Section
Strategic Planning + Economic Development Directorate,
Cork City Council, City Hall, Cork

T: 021-492-4450
F: 021-492-4712
E: jeremy_ward@corkcity.ie
I: www.corkcity.ie



Cork City Heritage Open Day
Saturday, 18th August 2012

www.corkheritageopenday.ie

From: Owen Shinkwin [<mailto:owen@nationaltransport.ie>]

Sent: 03 August 2012 18:20

To: Jeremy Ward

Subject: RE: Mahon

Jeremy,

I'm actually out all of that week but will be back on 10th. If it's not too late for you, my preference would therefore be for the week commencing 10th Sep.

David is also available that week.

Regards,

Owen

From: Jeremy Ward [mailto:jeremy_ward@corkcity.ie]

Sent: 03 August 2012 18:09

To: Owen Shinkwin

Subject: Mahon

Liz K / Gerry B are out all of that week [just confirmed]. Are you and Dave free at all w/c 3/9? Please confirm. Thanks

Regards

Jeremy Ward
Acting / Senior Planner

Planning Policy Section
Strategic Planning + Economic Development Directorate,
Cork City Council, City Hall, Cork

T: 021-492-4450
F: 021-492-4712

E: jeremy_ward@corkcity.ie
I: www.corkcity.ie



Cork City Heritage Open Day
Saturday, 18th August 2012

www.corkheritageopenday.ie

170

Owen Shinkwin

From: Jeremy Ward <jeremy_ward@corkcity.ie>
Sent: 09 June 2011 12:52
To: Michael MacAree
Cc: David Clements; Owen Shinkwin; Ann Bogan
Subject: RE: Mahon LAP

Mick

We have now decided to go ahead with the meeting on Friday 17 June 2011. We therefore hereby request your attendance at the following:

1. A general meeting with representatives from Planning + Development and Roads and Transportation at 11am in City Hall, Cork [if you wish to arrive earlier and go for a coffee with people that would be fine but people from Dublin normally tend to travel on the 8am train and arrive to the building at 11am]. This would be a hello and give you a chance to raise issues [would you like to suggest an agenda for this?];
2. A meeting on Mahon LAP from 12pm with a distilled group [from the above] and 3 representatives from the NRA [Richard Bowen, Paul Moran and Tara Spain].

I can't be precise at this stage who will be attending on behalf of the City Council but the aim is to make the meeting both integrated and representative of both Directorates. I am led to believe that Denis O'Mahony, Director of Services will be in attendance and would therefore chair the meeting. Also in attendance will be Ann Bogan [Senior Planner], the Planning Policy Section manager.

I will forward documentation to you and the NRA between now and the end of tomorrow so that you will have ample time to have a look before attendance. I could give you a call to run through the documentation if this would be of benefit.

It is regrettable that Owen Shinkwin will not be able to attend but we can meet him at the next meeting. I hope that this is acceptable to you and Owen.

When you come to City Hall please come to the Planning Counter and we will bring you to meeting room 1.1.

See you next week.

Regards

Jeremy Ward
Senior Executive Planner

Planning Policy Section
Planning + Development Directorate
Cork City Council, City Hall, Cork

Tel: 021-492-4450
E: jeremy_ward@corkcity.ie

From: Michael MacAree [<mailto:mickm@nationaltransport.ie>]
Sent: 09 June 2011 10:48
To: Jeremy Ward
Cc: David Clements; Owen Shinkwin
Subject: RE: Mahon LAP

Jeremy,

I would be available on Monday (after 11am), Tuesday (pm for an hour), Thursday at between 11am -1pm. My colleague Owen Shinkwin is on Holidays and I would like at least one of us to attend. I also note that the next CASP meeting is on the 22nd of June, if the NTA is invited (Request from our Director to Dan Buggy) then this may be another opportunity. Let me know if any of the dates next week would suit, we would be happy to host a joint meeting if required.

(Note: contact name of third person is David Clements rather than Eoin Farrell as I had previously stated).

Regards,

Mick Mac Aree

From: Jeremy Ward [mailto:jeremy_ward@corkcity.ie]
Sent: 09 June 2011 10:40
To: Michael MacAree
Subject: Mahon LAP

Hi Michael

It was great to talk to you yesterday and to make an initial contact.

We are having a bit of a 'mare trying to arrange the meeting due to people being on leave so I just wanted to get back to you briefly.

As discussed, we understand that it would be desirable to get together to have a "hello"/ general meeting first and then to talk about the specifics of the Mahon LAP (what we are trying to achieve / assumptions / predications, etc.).

We are currently considering the possibility of either:

- Meeting the NTA first; or
- Meeting both parties together.

Either would have pluses and minuses, but it is clear that we should get the higher level objectives discussed before going into detail. We are also considering whether to come to Dublin [e.g. NTA in the morning and NRA in the afternoon].

If we need to try and arrange the meeting next week on Tuesday or Wednesday we were wondering if your colleagues (Owen Shinkwin and Owen Farrell) would be available to meet even if you weren't. This isn't ideal but may be a compromise to make things happen. Would it be possible for you to forward their contact details? If this isn't possible then we may have to fall-back to an NRA meeting followed by an NTA meeting. This is due to a commitment that has been made.

Thanks very much for your eagerness to engage on integrating land use and transportation in Cork. We look forward to this and to working with you and the NTA very much.

Best regards

Jeremy

Regards

Jeremy Ward
Senior Executive Planner

Planning Policy Section
Planning + Development Directorate,
Cork City Council, City Hall, Cork

Tel: 021-492-4450

E: jeremy_ward@corkcity.ie

From: Jeremy Ward <jeremy_ward@corkcity.ie>
Sent: 13 July 2011 16:10
To: David Clements
Cc: Owen Shinkwin
Subject: RE: NTA Feedback - Mahon LAP Modelling Methodology
Attachments: 130711 Draft Minute JW v1.2.pdf

Hi David

I just tried calling but you weren't available. I wonder if you could spare a mo' to give me a call.
I attach a draft minute of the meeting held on the 17th for your consideration and comment.

I was wondering if it might be possible for you to give us some guidance on employment / residential ratios in different contexts from your experience in Dublin [e.g. with / without the LUAS, adjacent to motorways, suburban, size of planning unit, etc]. I think that it was you who suggested that a 30/70 split was normal. We are aiming at a 50/50 split in terms of new development, which might be 30/70 overall [would have to do the number-crunching]. Is this in terms of what? Floorspace? People? Trips? Etc. Your insight would be very much appreciated.

Please give me a call to discuss if you have a mo'. My phone number is below.

Regards

Jeremy Ward
Senior Executive Planner

Planning Policy Section
Planning & Development Directorate,
Cork City Council, City Hall, Cork

Tel: 021-492-4450
E: jeremy_ward@corkcity.ie

From: David Clements [mailto:David.Clements@nationaltransport.ie]
Sent: 01 July 2011 16:49
To: Jeremy Ward
Cc: Michael MacAree; Frank McCabe
Subject: NTA Feedback - Mahon LAP Modelling Methodology

Hi Jeremy,

We have reviewed the documentation on the methodology proposed and would make the following comments.

In deriving model input data, it is important to be cognisant of all-day travel demand, particularly for retail, and the requirements and nature of local trips. Neither of these elements can be fully accounted for using a traditional highway model which assesses the impact of trips, focussed on mechanised modes, on the road network. While the methodology seems reasonable, based along traditional lines, we feel that it needs to be supported by more evidence based analysis

Trip rates

Trip rates would be more accurately derived from existing developments using empirical data sources, rather than basing it solely on floorspace. The latter should be used as a check rather than a determinant. These trip rates can be calculated on the basis of the different land uses proposed as follows:

Employment:

Using POWCAR data from 2006 for a similar type of development elsewhere in Cork, in combination with observed travel patterns from any existing surveys, the numbers of employees and the trip rate can be derived for the office and employment elements of the proposed development and can be applied throughout the day.

Residential:

Data from the NTA Household Survey will give an estimate of trips generated across the day from their origins. Even though this survey dates from 2006 and relates to the GDA only, it has been found that the trips generated by households does not vary by time or location.

Retail:

The NTA Household Survey, in combination with local data sources, should give a more robust basis for the derivation of trip rates to retail. Again, this will give an all-day figure for 7-days of the week which can be used to examine peak retail times at weekends. POWCAR data can be used to estimate a trip rate for retail employees.

Education:

The NTA Education survey for the GDA, also from 2006, will give detailed empirical evidence for any school trips that may be generated in the Mahon area. Again this should be examined in combination with local data.

Mode Splits

The mode split for walking and cycling could be derived from an analysis of POWCAR and by making assumptions based on potential for these modes. A target could be derived from developments in Cork, or elsewhere, which have a high walking and cycling mode share.

An analysis of trip lengths from the POWCAR database would then show potential for these modes – i.e. any trips to work or education below 2km are potential walking trips and trips below 5km for cycling. A similar approach could be used for Retail based on the empirical evidence provided by the NTA Household Survey. This stage would be part of Phase 2 as set out in the methodology paper, in advance of the application of Smarter Travel.

Analysis of Local Trips

The highway model does not examine trips within model zones – internal trips. For the purposes of planning, it is these trips that can be most important. While the model will give a ratio of internal trips as a percentage of trips generated by, or attracted to, each zone, it is not intended as a tool to consider local network measures – particularly any measures related to quality. The Transport Assessment should be cognisant of these factors and in a full analysis, examine the needs of local or internal trips, particularly as it relates to walking and cycling measures in the LAP.

In summary:

(a) The modelling methodology seems reasonable, but along very traditional lines and needs to be supported by more evidence based analysis – as per b and c below.

(b) Trip attraction rates should be derived from the POWCAR data using similar (industry type) developments - it should not rely on floor area, but should just take number of jobs and appropriate trip rates from POWCAR. There is also data from the NTA Household survey and the Education survey which may be of assistance in deriving the trip rates.

(c) Rather than just setting targets for walking and cycling based on distance between home and work, the targets should be based if possible on evidence from the POWCAR dataset. E.g. take an existing mixed use development in Cork where walking and cycling percentages are high – examine the patterns of travel & trip length distribution etc and set this example as the target. If no such good example exists in Cork – take a good example from elsewhere (e.g. a town centre with good walking and cycling percentages). In setting targets make sure there are no natural physical barriers to walking & cycling – e.g. steep hills etc. In the absence of such physical barriers, targets achieved in other areas can be achieved for the Mahon development through network, Demand Management and parking measures as suggested in the MVA report.

If you have any queries regarding the above, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Thanks,
David

David Clements
Land Use & Transport Planner



NATIONAL TRANSPORT AUTHORITY
Dún Scéine,
Iveagh Court,
Harcourt Lane,
Dublin 2

Tel: + 353 (0)1 879 8300
Ddi: + 353 (0) 1 879 8305

david.clements@nationaltransport.ie
Web: <http://www.nationaltransport.ie>

Draft Minute

Cork City Council
Comhairle Cathrach Chorchai
City Hall
Cork



Planning Policy Section
Planning + Development Directorate

Project: Mahon Local Area Plan 2011

Meeting purpose: Strategic Transport + Traffic Assessment

Author: Jeremy Ward

Date of Meeting: Friday 17 June 2011 @ 12pm

Meeting Venue: Room 1.1, City Hall, Cork

Note of meeting prepared: Wednesday 13 July 2011 by Jeremy Ward [v1.2 4.00pm]

Attendees

Cork City Council
Planning + Development
Ann Bogan, Erin O'Brien [part],
Jeremy Ward
Roads + Transportation
Elizabeth Kidney + John Gibson
Apologies
Noel Tummon

NTA
David Clements, Mick MacAree,
Owen Shinkwin
NRA
Paul Moran, Richard Bowen
Tara Spain

Item	Points	Actions
Introduction	<p>AB opened the meeting and stated that the purpose of the meeting was to give the NTA and the NRA an update on the Mahon Local Area Plan 2011.</p> <p>AB gave a brief overview of the Core Strategy for the city. The NRA outlined their investment strategy for Cork in relation to the Core Strategy.</p> <p>There was a lengthy discussion about the role of the national roads network and the need to strike a balance between strategic role and local distributor role within urban areas. The N25 has 11 junctions on a 14 kilometres stretch, which means that it has a very strong local distributor role.</p> <p>The NRA stated that their aim is to see "freeflow" traffic on the national road network to serve the strategic needs of the region. The NRA considers that freeflow [or near freeflow] is essential to serve the needs of the Ringaskiddy employment node. There was a discussion about the importance of Cork City in relation to the road network.</p>	
Mahon LAP	<p>The City Council gave a brief overview of the four Mahon development options and the related transport and traffic issues, and the approach being taken in the strategic assessment. The following points were discussed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The NRA is particularly concerned that the Jack Lynch tunnel is "at capacity". This is defined by daily volume of cars using the N25. There was a discussion about whether confined periods of congestion constitute a real problem within an urban area; 	

Item	Points	Actions
Mahon LAP [contd.]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The NRA expressed concern at the volume of traffic using the N25 to get to Mahon Point [from Glanmire / Riverstown / Carrigtwohill]. The NTA indicated that from their experience in Dublin they could provide guidance on the appropriate balance between employment / residential uses from a variety of examples with different characteristics [e.g. a one-third employment : two-thirds residential]. The size of the planning unit and location in relation to the transportation system will therefore make a difference to how many jobs are appropriate; The NTA strongly recommend that the City Council employ area-based parking strategies, rather than site-specific parking strategies. 	NTA to provide ratio guidance
Mahon Point Shopping Centre / demand management	<p>There was a lengthy discussion about the traffic and transportation issues pertaining to Mahon Point Shopping Centre, and the challenges that it poses to the National and Local Road Network and wider accessibility.</p> <p>Issues discussed included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Volume of traffic using N25 to get to Mahon Point [this is the main problem at Mahon]; The need for a range of measures to assist access to Mahon and MPSC; Demand Management Tools employed at Liffey Valley Shopping Centre via condition at South Dublin CoCo; Demand management tools employed at Blanchardstown Shopping Centre via condition at Fingal County Council; Demand Management relating to Mahon Point, such as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> N25 road pricing, including negative impacts on Cork City Centre and local road network; and Regulations to allow local authorities to impose car parking charges on private car parks; Bus-based park and ride from north side of tunnel [e.g. from Dunkettle]; <p>The NTA suggested that we also look at the transportation and traffic strategy for Cherrywood [Carrickmines] in Dublin.</p> <p>The NTA also suggested that we should consider examples of relevant places to develop reasonable assumptions for modal split / trip generation, trip distributions to develop a clear understanding of the issues involved.</p> <p>There was a brief discussion about funding of infrastructure.</p>	

Conclusions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> NTA agreed to provide a guidance note to Cork City Council on what they consider to be an appropriate approach to the Mahon Strategic Modelling [Transport and Traffic]; All parties look forward to working together on this and other strategic projects of significance. <p>AB thanked the NTA and NRA for coming to Cork to discuss Mahon and for their helpfulness and willingness to engage on the future of Mahon.</p>	NTA to provide
AOB	None.	
DONM	None defined.	

Jeremy Ward, SEP / 13 July 2011

Owen Shinkwin

From: David Clements
Sent: 20 July 2011 15:25
To: Jeremy Ward
Subject: RE: NTA Feedback - Mahon LAP Modelling Methodology [Filed 13 Jan 2012 17:05]

Hi Jeremy,

I'll try to give some more information here and I hope it's of some help

1. Traffic and transportation issues are mainly related to scale of development, although the ratios have a bearing. Basically the more employment in an area, the more trips are attracted in in the AM Peak and generated out in the PM Peak. This could mean, in a mixed use area for example, that public transport services are required in both directions at both peak times. So a 50:50 split of 5,000 residents and 5,000 people would have a very different impact on the network and would have very different needs than a split of 9,000 residents and 1,000 jobs. The consequences of the ratio chosen can be assessed strategically using the transport model.
2. We don't have the full POWCAR data set for 2002 before Luas was introduced so we haven't done that specific analysis. Perhaps South Dublin or Dún Laoghaire Rathdown County Council have done surveys on the land use impact of developing public transport. Our contact in SDCC is Paul Hogan and Mary Henchy in DLRCC.
3. We also don't have any data on other cities. Our main focus to date was on the Transport Strategy for the GDA so that's the only area we have analysed in this way.

I'd just like to reiterate that the ratios in the sample data set given are in no way indicative of good or bad planning. In order to fully understand the merits or otherwise of these areas, a much wider analysis of travel behaviour and non-planning data would be needed which may be beyond the scope of the Mahon LAP.

If you wish to have a chat about this, please give me a call on the number below.

Thanks,
David

David Clements
Land Use & Transport Planner



NATIONAL TRANSPORT AUTHORITY
Dún Scéine,
Iveagh Court,
Harcourt Lane,
Dublin 2

Direct Dial: + 353 (0)1 879 8305

From: Jeremy Ward [mailto:jeremy_ward@corkcity.ie]
Sent: 19 July 2011 15:01
To: David Clements
Subject: RE: NTA Feedback - Mahon LAP Modelling Methodology

Hi David

I hope you are well. I am just writing to request a small favour regarding the ratio view of the world – if you have a little time to respond.

I have a couple of questions that I might put to you regarding the below data and their context / story – that you could respond to when you get a mo' following a conversation that I just had with Ian Byrne [I hear that you are meeting him later on for a drink].

1. What are the transportation / traffic issues relating to points on the ratio scale [e.g. going above the 0.5 ratio]?
2. Do you have pre-LUAS ratios for Dundrum and Tallaght [i.e. what difference did RT make to the overall picture]?
3. Do you have examples of similar analyses for any UK cities [as a matter of interest]. Any the size of Cork [i.e. a small city as opposed to a middle-sized city like Dublin].

Any clarification / amplification you could offer would be very much appreciated.

Cheers

Jeremy

Regards

Jeremy Ward
Senior Executive Planner

Planning Policy Section
Planning + Development Directorate,
Cork City Council, City Hall, Cork

Tel: 021-492-4450
E: jeremy_ward@corkcity.ie

From: David Clements [mailto:David.Clements@nationaltransport.ie]
Sent: 13 July 2011 17:26
To: Jeremy Ward
Subject: RE: NTA Feedback - Mahon LAP Modelling Methodology

Hi Jeremy,

I tried to give you a call just there to discuss your email. I can't really recall the details of the conversation we had but I've attached some quick analysis below of the District Centres around the M50 in Dublin which could be comparable in spatial characteristics to Mahon. Generally, in local planning, such ratios would refer to floorspace but in the NTA, because we are only really concerned with the generation of trips, we tend to look at numbers of people and numbers of jobs.

Note the attached map which shows the areas to which the figures apply. These areas were defined as District Centres for the purposes of the GDA transport strategy using a GIS tool and some of the resultant shapes may seem off – but they can be explained. I hope this gives some indication of the type of ratios evident in these areas in 2006. They do not tend to change much over time either – over a wider suburban type area as population grows, employment grows too. If you want some tighter analysis of some EDs we can provide that and possibly quite quickly.

I hope this data is of use to you and please give me a call when you get a chance and we can discuss this.

District Centre	Pop2006	Emp2006	Ratio
Blanchardstown	28,266	6,717	0.24
Blanchardstown_SC	55,625	17,803	0.32
Bray	33,731	11,848	0.35
Dundrum	30,160	14,316	0.47
Liffey Valley	13,779	7,447	0.54
Swords	45,514	15,920	0.35
Tallaght	73,999	28,981	0.39

Thanks,
David

David Clements
Land Use & Transport Planner



NATIONAL TRANSPORT AUTHORITY
Dún Scéine,
Iveagh Court,
Harcourt Lane,
Dublin 2

Tel: + 353 (0)1 879 8300
Ddi: + 353 (0) 1 879 8305

david.clements@nationaltransport.ie
Web: <http://www.nationaltransport.ie>

From: Jeremy Ward [mailto:jeremy_ward@corkcity.ie]
Sent: 13 July 2011 16:10
To: David Clements
Cc: Owen Shinkwin
Subject: RE: NTA Feedback - Mahon LAP Modelling Methodology

Hi David

I just tried calling but you weren't available. I wonder if you could spare a mo' to give me a call.
I attach a draft minute of the meeting held on the 17th for your consideration and comment.

I was wondering if it might be possible for you to give us some guidance on employment / residential ratios in different contexts from your experience in Dublin [e.g. with / without the LUAS, adjacent to motorways, suburban, size of

planning unit, etc]. I think that it was you who suggested that a 30/70 split was normal. We are aiming at a 50/50 split in terms of new development, which might be 30/70 overall [would have to do the number-crunching]. Is this in terms of what? Floorspace? People? Trips? Etc. Your insight would be very much appreciated.

Please give me a call to discuss if you have a mo'. My phone number is below.

Regards

Jeremy Ward
Senior Executive Planner

Planning Policy Section
Planning + Development Directorate,
Cork City Council, City Hall, Cork

Tel: 021-492-4450
E: jeremy_ward@corkcity.ie

From: David Clements [<mailto:David.Clements@nationaltransport.ie>]
Sent: 01 July 2011 16:49
To: Jeremy Ward
Cc: Michael MacAree; Frank McCabe
Subject: NTA Feedback - Mahon LAP Modelling Methodology

Hi Jeremy,

We have reviewed the documentation on the methodology proposed and would make the following comments.

In deriving model input data, it is important to be cognisant of all-day travel demand, particularly for retail, and the requirements and nature of local trips. Neither of these elements can be fully accounted for using a traditional highway model which assesses the impact of trips, focussed on mechanised modes, on the road network. While the methodology seems reasonable, based along traditional lines, we feel that it needs to be supported by more evidence based analysis

Trip rates

Trip rates would be more accurately derived from existing developments using empirical data sources, rather than basing it solely on floorspace. The latter should be used as a check rather than a determinant. These trip rates can be calculated on the basis of the different land uses proposed as follows:

Employment:

Using POWCAR data from 2006 for a similar type of development elsewhere in Cork, in combination with observed travel patterns from any existing surveys, the numbers of employees and the trip rate can be derived for the office and employment elements of the proposed development and can be applied throughout the day.

Residential:

Data from the NTA Household Survey will give an estimate of trips generated across the day from their origins. Even though this survey dates from 2006 and relates to the GDA only, it has been found that the trips generated by households does not vary by time or location.

Retail:

The NTA Household Survey, in combination with local data sources, should give a more robust basis for the derivation of trip rates to retail. Again, this will give an all-day figure for 7-days of the week which can be used to examine peak retail times at weekends. POWCAR data can be used to estimate a trip rate for retail employees.

Education:

The NTA Education survey for the GDA, also from 2006, will give detailed empirical evidence for any school trips that may be generated in the Mahon area. Again this should be examined in combination with local data.

Mode Splits

The mode split for walking and cycling could be derived from an analysis of POWCAR and by making assumptions based on potential for these modes. A target could be derived from developments in Cork, or elsewhere, which have a high walking and cycling mode share.

An analysis of trip lengths from the POWCAR database would then show potential for these modes – i.e. any trips to work or education below 2km are potential walking trips and trips below 5km for cycling. A similar approach could be used for Retail based on the empirical evidence provided by the NTA Household Survey. This stage would be part of Phase 2 as set out in the methodology paper, in advance of the application of Smarter Travel.

Analysis of Local Trips

The highway model does not examine trips within model zones – internal trips. For the purposes of planning, it is these trips that can be most important. While the model will give a ratio of internal trips as a percentage of trips generated by, or attracted to, each zone, it is not intended as a tool to consider local network measures – particularly any measures related to quality. The Transport Assessment should be cognisant of these factors and in a full analysis, examine the needs of local or internal trips, particularly as it relates to walking and cycling measures in the LAP.

In summary:

- (a) The modelling methodology seems reasonable, but along very traditional lines and needs to be supported by more evidence based analysis – as per b and c below.
- (b) Trip attraction rates should be derived from the POWCAR data using similar (industry type) developments - it should not rely on floor area, but should just take number of jobs and appropriate trip rates from POWCAR. There is also data from the NTA Household survey and the Education survey which may be of assistance in deriving the trip rates.
- (c) Rather than just setting targets for walking and cycling based on distance between home and work, the targets should be based if possible on evidence from the POWCAR dataset. E.g. take an existing mixed use development in Cork where walking and cycling percentages are high – examine the patterns of travel & trip length distribution etc and set this example as the target. If no such good example exists in Cork – take a good example from elsewhere (e.g. a town centre with good walking and cycling percentages). In setting targets make sure there are no natural physical barriers to walking & cycling – e.g. steep hills etc. In the absence of such physical barriers, targets achieved in other areas can be achieved for the Mahon development through network, Demand Management and parking measures as suggested in the MVA report.

If you have any queries regarding the above, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Thanks,
David

David Clements
Land Use & Transport Planner



NATIONAL TRANSPORT AUTHORITY

Dún Scéine,
Iveagh Court,
Harcourt Lane,
Dublin 2

Tel: + 353 (0)1 879 8300
Ddi: + 353 (0) 1 879 8305

david.clements@nationaltransport.ie
Web: <http://www.nationaltransport.ie>

Mahon Local Area Plan (Land Use and Transport Strategy Review)

Documents Prepared

- Mahon Strategic Transport and Traffic Assessment
- Jacobs Island Additional Development Assessment

NRA Submission (19th September 2012) – *Points Raised*

- An absence of any reference to the DOELG's Spatial Planning and National Roads statutory guidance (of particular relevance to Section 5.4 of the TTA)
- No detailed analysis of the Mahon N40 Interchange – a serious issue, given existing capacity constraints
- Re. point that *'LU Option 3 will have negative impact on Mahon Interchange even if mode split targets are achieved, although this impact will be marginal'*, it has not been explained on what basis the impact has been determined as *'marginal'*
 - Re. %age traffic increases on the N40 associated with LU Option 3, it is not clear whether these relate to AADT or Peak Hour
 - In light of this issue, it is even more crucial that a detailed analysis be undertaken of the impacts on the Mahon Interchange/ N40 or existing land uses and the various LU options being considered
 - No meaningful mitigation measures proposed re. management of traffic at the Mahon Interchange
 - More generally, re. all national road junctions in the Metropolitan Area, the impact of development generated traffic must be managed so as to reduce impact on strategic movements
 - Based on presumption of continued dominance of car-based orbital movements, there is a need to provide strengthened public transport choice on existing orbital routes and along key desire lines linking designated development areas in the north and SE of the Metropolitan area
 - Reference to the NRA's support of this objective, through its investment/ planned investment in upgrading junctions on the N40 and through involvement in TDM-oriented studies such as the N28 Study with its emphasis on MMPing on the N28 (ref. Bloomfield I/C) and Cork Science & Innovation Park (ref. Curraheen I/C)
- Conclusion – NRA still remains to be convinced that the focus for development in the area surrounding the Mahon I/C will not be excessively dependent on the use of the private car and the provision of access to the national road network.

OS Comment on the NRA's *N40/ Orbital Movements* point

I don't think that further capacity increases at interchanges on the N40 is going to affect a modal shift to public transport for orbitally-based movements generally, including those using the N40 corridor, even if more bus services were to be provided (itself outside the remit of local authorities). Further capacity increases (and associated reductions in journey times for orbital trips by car, using

the N40) would probably confer an even greater competitive advantage on the car over the use of public transport, even if those same reductions in journey times/ increases in journey time reliability were to allow for more reliable bus services along this route.

The key to this argument lies with the willingness or otherwise to embrace transport demand management, both in the management of the N40 Corridor/ the national road network generally and through a range of 'destination' measures which focus both on reducing the level of provision for the car and promoting/ enabling the provision and use of alternative modes.

In this regard, both the NRA and the two local authorities need to clarify their positions in regard to the matter of TDM on the N40 and other parts of the national road network within the Metropolitan Area. Are they in favour of TDM/ Corridor Management or not and if so, what measures do they have in mind? If there are constraints to the introduction of such objective-led TDM, what are they and what solutions/ level of implementation/ type of implementation might be possible, and by which agency/ agencies?

Whilst raising concerns about the location of trip-intensive and large scale development next to national road interchanges may be understandable and supportable, doing so in the absence of a coherent and clearly stated position on *the other half of the equation* (transport demand management) is not particularly productive.

Other Remarks re. TDM and current government policy (*Development and National Roads*)

If it's intended to incorporate 'refined' policies and objectives formulated during the preparation of the Mahon LAP into the subsequent review of the City Development Plan, policy areas most appropriately formulated at a strategic level such as TDM should not be led by policy formulation at LAP level, as the more localised the focus in dealing with TDM, the more narrowly focused it is going to be (the extreme case being the MMP typically appended to planning application TIA). In a case where the main focus of the LAP is to validate the provision of further trip intensive and large scale development adjacent to a national road interchange, such a locally focused approach is not appropriate, leading as it would to a greater chance of such development being validated and a more narrowly focused and piecemeal approach being taken to TDM, ultimately resulting in policy failure and non-compliance with government policy as it relates to *Spatial Planning and National Roads* (see pages 21-22).

Mahon TTA

- **Study Objectives**
 - Based on DoT Guidelines (5 key categories)
- **Key Project Indicators (KPIs)**
 - 17 indicators under the 5 key study objectives
- **Policy Context**
 - Development within the district centre to achieve more urban format and broader mix of uses, higher densities, reduced surface parking, street frontage development, layout reconfiguration
 - Higher densities and appropriate supporting infrastructure
 - High standard of urban design
 - Avoid undermining the potential of the wider area
 - Employment growth to linked to overall Cork City Employment Strategy/ CASP Update 2008
 - c.50% of employment growth to be allocated to City Centre and Inner Docklands
 - c.50% of employment growth to be allocated equally to Outer Docklands, Blackpool and Mahon
 - Employment growth above CASP targets must be linked to provision of BRT and associated need to provide sufficient transport demand (for BRT)
 - Reference to relative strengths of Mahon as compared with other existing strategic employment sites outside of the City (re. accessibility and location within core area of Cork Gateway)
 - TDM
 - Strict new car parking standards will be enforced
 - Based on/ contingent on? introduction of standardised Metropolitan Area car parking standards
 - Implementation of AWMMP for all employment sites
- **Key Development Areas**
 - Mahon Ind est
 - Bessboro House
 - Major residential development
 - Lough Mahon Technology Park
 - Remains in employment use
 - Mahon Point
- **3 no. land use options**
 - 2 no. tranches
 - To 2021

- 2021-2031
 - Preferred LU option (Option 3)
- **Assessment methodology (Mahon Area Traffic Model) AM & PM Peak**
 - Common Appraisal Framework (DoT) – Study Objectives
 - Matrices - Census data for trip rates, trip types and mode splits ('06 SAPS, POWCAR)
 - Average household size
 - Employment densities by LU
 - CASP SATURN Traffic Model
 - Mode share adjustment based on Census data & LU distribution
 - Model testing of 3 no. LU options for FY (2021)
 - Evaluation of performance through KPI framework (agreed KPI's)
 - Selection of Preferred LU option (Option 3)
 - Future Year (2031) test of Option 3
 - Evaluation of performance of preferred option through KPI framework
 - Strategic High Infrastructure Intervention tests on Preferred Option
 - Recommended LU and Infrastructure (preferred option) for 2021 & 2031
 - *Population Targets derived from employment targets (CCDP 2009-15 and CASP Update), based on target employment/population ratio*
- **Recommended LU Strategy (Option 3)**
 - Option 3 (Zoned modular approach – new residential neighbourhoods + consolidated commercial core)
 - densification
 - Shorter trips
 - Greater propensity to use non-car modes
 - Marginal impact on the N40 in 2021, becoming negligible in 2031
 - 4% and 2% increase in traffic on N40 (w+e of I/C) in 2021
 - Significant supporting p.t. & walking/ cycling
 - Does not require significant highway infrastructure investment in the longer term
 - Likely to be an attractive LU option to the market
 - Will require a step-change in level of p.t. service provision, equivalent to those identified in CATS
 - Tranch 2 is contingent on a 55% non-car mode share being achieved
 - BRT (3-5 minute peak-period service frequencies in Mahon area)
 - In the absence of BRT, Tranch 2 quantum to be reduced to 30% of total
 - Significant improvements in walking/ cycling
 - Proposed Supporting Transportation Infrastructure
 - Bessborough Bridge of Passage Railway Line
 - Link from SC to Estuary Road
 - Bus lanes on Mahon Link Road

- Bus gate between SC and St Michael's Drive and bus lane linking to Mahon Link Road
- Bus lane on Skehard (without reducing gen. veh. capacity)
- Bus route to bus gate via St. Michael's Drive
- Left turn slip from SC to N40 SRR?
- Other relevant transportation infrastructure
 - Mahon – C.C. Green Route (in conjunction with Docklands Dev't)
 - Skehard Road upgrade from Silverdale Drive
 - BRT (feasibility study underway)
- TDM
 - Recommendation that AWMMP be adopted and implemented by all employers
- Monitoring of Traffic

Population to Employment Ratio Issue (as referenced on p.31 of TTA)

Clarification of the ratios set out in section 4.3.8 of the Mahon TTA

In relation to the ratios in section 4.3.8, the 0.33 figure is derived from an analysis of the number of jobs in major suburban employment locations which are filled by local residents. i.e. in an area with 5,000 jobs, 1,650 of them are likely to be taken up locally. The other 2/3rds of local residents would travel to the city centre or other employment locations. This figure therefore is not related to a job: population ratio.

The 0.5 figure seems to be more applicable to a job: labour force ratio, as using it as a job: population ratio implies that there would be a local job for everyone in the local labour force, which would not be the case in most suburban locations where a mix of uses is proposed. But this is a matter of policy for the local authority in terms of how they see the area developing and how many employees they would like to attract in to the area from other locations. The data from Dublin shows a fairly wide variation in this regard depending on mainly the scale and nature of employment planned.

Overall, the NTA would like to clarify that the ratios do not compromise "guidance" from the NTA, informal or otherwise, in terms of good planning policy, rather we have merely provided data from the 2006 Census which the City Council can choose to use as a guide or not in planning for the Mahon area. This will be determined by the Council's own vision for Mahon, whether it should be a suburban location with employment at the local scale or a major economic node to which people will travel from the wider Metropolitan Area to work every day.

In terms of the paragraph in the document we would recommend that it is altered to read along the lines of the following:

"Table 4-7 sets out the population: employment ratio for Mahon from the 2006 Census. Data from select suburban areas in Dublin indicate a range from 0.24 to 0.54 generally. It is the policy of the City Council that the ratio for the Mahon area as defined would be 0.xx:1."

NOTES

NRA Comments

- No detailed analysis of the Mahon N40 Interchange – a serious issue, given existing capacity constraints
- Re. point that *'LU Option 3 will have negative impact on Mahon Interchange even if mode split targets are achieved, although this impact will be marginal'*, it has not been explained on what basis the impact has been determined as *'marginal'*
 - Re. %age traffic increases on the N40 associated with LU Option 3, it is not clear whether these relate to AADT or Peak Hour
 - In light of this issue, it is even more crucial that a detailed analysis be undertaken of the impacts on the Mahon Interchange/ N40 or existing land uses and the various LU options being considered
 - No meaningful mitigation measures proposed re. management of traffic at the Mahon Interchange
 - More generally, re. all national road junctions in the Metropolitan Area, the impact of development generated traffic must be managed so as to reduce impact on strategic movements
 - Based on presumption of continued dominance of car-based orbital movements, there is a need to provide strengthened public transport choice on existing orbital routes and along key desire lines linking designated development areas in the north and SE of the Metropolitan area
 - Reference to the NRA's support of this objective, through its investment/ planned investment in upgrading junctions on the N40 and through involvement in TDM-oriented studies such as the N28 Study with its emphasis on MMPing on the N28 (ref. Bloomfield I/C) and Cork Science & Innovation Park (ref. Curraheen I/C)
- Conclusion – NRA still remains to be convinced that the focus for development in the area surrounding the Mahon I/C will not be excessively dependent on the use of the private car and the provision of access to the national road network.

OS Comment on the NRA's N40/ Orbital Movements point

I don't think that further capacity increases at interchanges on the N40 is going to affect a modal shift to public transport for orbitally-based movements generally, including those using the N40 corridor, even if more bus services were to be provided (itself outside the remit of local authorities). Further capacity increases (and associated reductions in journey times for orbital trips by car, using the N40) would probably confer an even greater competitive advantage on the car over the use of public transport, even if those same reductions in journey times/ increases in journey time reliability were to allow for more reliable bus services along this route.

The key to this argument lies with the willingness or otherwise to embrace transport demand management, both in the management of the N40 Corridor/ the national road network generally

and through a range of 'destination' measures which focus both on reducing the level of provision for the car and promoting/ enabling the provision and use of alternative modes.

In this regard, both the NRA and the two local authorities need to clarify their positions in regard to the matter of TDM on the N40 and other parts of the national road network within the Metropolitan Area. Are they in favour of TDM/ Corridor Management or not and if so, what measures do they have in mind? If there are constraints to the introduction of such objective-led TDM, what are they and what solutions/ level of implementation/ type of implementation might be possible, and by which agency/ agencies?

Whilst raising concerns about the location of trip-intensive and large scale development next to national road interchanges may be understandable and supportable, doing so in the absence of a coherent and clearly stated position on *the other half of the equation* (transport demand management) is not particularly productive.

Other Remarks re. TDM and current government policy (*Development and National Roads*)

If it's intended to incorporate 'refined' policies and objectives formulated during the preparation of the Mahon LAP into the subsequent review of the City Development Plan, policy areas most appropriately formulated at a strategic level such as TDM should not be led by policy formulation at LAP level, as the more localised the focus in dealing with TDM, the more narrowly focused it is going to be (the extreme case being the MMP typically appended to planning application TIA). In a case where the main focus of the LAP is to validate the provision of further trip intensive and large scale development adjacent to a national road interchange, such a locally focused approach is not appropriate, leading as it would to a greater chance of such development being validated and a more narrowly focused and piecemeal approach being taken to TDM, ultimately resulting in policy failure and non-compliance with government policy as it relates to *Spatial Planning and National Roads* (see pages 21-22).

Mahon TTA

- **Study Objectives**
 - Based on DoT Guidelines (5 key categories)
- **Key Project Indicators (KPIs)**
 - 17 indicators under the 5 key study objectives
- **Policy Context**
 - Development within the district centre to achieve more urban format and broader mix of uses, higher densities, reduced surface parking, street frontage development, layout reconfiguration
 - Higher densities and appropriate supporting infrastructure
 - High standard of urban design
 - Avoid undermining the potential of the wider area

- Employment growth to linked to overall Cork City Employment Strategy/ CASP Update 2008
 - c.50% of employment growth to be allocated to City Centre and Inner Docklands
 - c.50% of employment growth to be allocated equally to Outer Docklands, Blackpool and Mahon
 - Employment growth above CASP targets must be linked to provision of BRT and associated need to provide sufficient transport demand (for BRT)
 - Reference to relative strengths of Mahon as compared with other existing strategic employment sites outside of the City (re. accessibility and location within core area of Cork Gateway)
 - TDM
 - Strict new car parking standards will be enforced
 - Based on/ contingent on? introduction of standardised Metropolitan Area car parking standards
 - Implementation of AWMMP for all employment sites
- **Key Development Areas**
 - Mahon Industrial Estate
 - Bessboro House
 - Major residential development
 - Lough Mahon Technology Park
 - Remains in employment use
 - Mahon Point
 - Jacob's Island
 - **3 no. land use options**
 - 2 no. tranches
 - To 2021
 - 2021-2031
 - Preferred LU option (Option 3)
 - Jacob's Island (Option 3a)
 - **Assessment methodology (Mahon Area Traffic Model) AM & PM Peak**
 - Common Appraisal Framework (DoT) – Study Objectives
 - Matrices - Census data for trip rates, trip types and mode splits ('06 SAPS, POWCAR)
 - Average household size
 - Employment densities by LU
 - CASP SATURN Traffic Model
 - Mode share adjustment based on Census data & LU distribution
 - Model testing of 3 no. LU options for FY (2021)
 - Evaluation of performance through KPI framework (agreed KPI's)
 - Selection of Preferred LU option (Option 3)

- Future Year (2031) test of Option 3
 - Evaluation of performance of preferred option through KPI framework
 - Strategic High Infrastructure Intervention tests on Preferred Option
 - Recommended LU and Infrastructure (preferred option) for 2021 & 2031
 - *Population Targets derived from employment targets (CCDP 2009-15 and CASP Update), based on target employment/population ratio*
- **Recommended LU Strategy (Option 3)**
 - Option 3 (Zoned modular approach – new residential neighbourhoods + consolidated commercial core)
 - densification
 - Shorter trips
 - Greater propensity to use non-car modes
 - Marginal impact on the N40 in 2021, becoming negligible in 2031
 - 4% and 2% increase in traffic on N40 (w+e of I/C) in 2021
 - Significant supporting p.t. & walking/ cycling
 - Does not require significant highway infrastructure investment in the longer term
 - Likely to be an attractive LU option to the market
 - Will require a step-change in level of p.t. service provision, equivalent to those identified in CATS
 - Tranch 1 is contingent on a 45% non-car mode share being achieved
 - Green Route between Docklands and Mahon
 - Tranch 2 is contingent on a 55% non-car mode share being achieved
 - BRT (3-5 minute peak-period service frequencies in Mahon area)
 - In the absence of BRT, Tranch 2 quantum to be reduced to 30% of total
 - Significant improvements in walking/ cycling
 - Proposed Supporting Transportation Infrastructure
 - Bessborough Bridge of Passage Railway Line
 - Link from SC to Estuary Road
 - Bus lanes on Mahon Link Road
 - Bus gate between SC and St Michael's Drive and bus lane linking to Mahon Link Road
 - Bus lane on Skehard (without reducing gen. veh. capacity)
 - Bus route to bus gate via St. Michael's Drive
 - Left turn slip from SC to N40 SRR?
 - Other relevant transportation infrastructure
 - Mahon – C.C. Green Route (in conjunction with Docklands Dev't)
 - Skehard Road upgrade from Silverdale Drive
 - BRT (feasibility study underway)
 - TDM
 - Recommendation that AWMMP be adopted and implemented by all employers

- Monitoring of Traffic

Policy Context for further large scale development adjacent to a national primary road interchange

The consideration of further significant development, particularly retail and commercial development in a location like Mahon presents particular challenges in regards to the following:

- Demonstrating that the scale of development and mix of uses proposed is consistent with current government policy (Spatial Planning and National Roads – Guidelines for Planning Authorities, January 2012).
- Achieving greater consolidation of the Cork Gateway's population and employment growth within Cork City in locations and in a manner which supports the greater use of non-car modes, reduces car dependency and prioritises

NTA Comments on the Mahon LAP (Land Use and Transport Strategy Review)

Date: 1st October 2012

Outline of Issues which the NTA recommends be taken into consideration, prior to the finalisation of the Land Use and Transport Strategy Review

Reference to and Compliance with Current Government Guidelines

In making the case for further large scale development at a location adjacent to a national road interchange, it is strongly recommended this is presented in the context of its consistency with current government guidelines as presented the DOELG's *Spatial Planning and National Roads*, particularly in regard to the evidence-based approach outlined in Section 2.4 and Section 2.13 (land use and transport planning checklist).

Development Quantums, Model Split Assumptions, Traffic Impact Assumptions, and Demand Management Measures

It is stated in the TTA that the impact that the preferred Land Use option (Option 3) will have on the Mahon Interchange will be 'marginal' under Tranch 1 and negligible under Tranch 2. These assumptions are supported by an assumed localisation of some employment trips (and associated modal shift to non-car modes) and the greater use of public transport for non-local trips, enabled by improvements in public transport services levels. Greater clarity is required on what trip distribution patterns modal splits underpin this assumption:

In the case of Tranch 1, no specific information has been provided on the associated trip distribution, but the mode split assumption (55% car) does appear to be derived from the mode shares that pertain to Dublin City for trips within 5km in length, in combination with the introduction of restrictive car parking standards and a doubling of bus services. However, it is not clear what percentage of total peak period trips would be within 5km in length and what mode split would apply to such trips. Also, it is not clear how the trip distribution patterns and public transport service patters pertain to Dublin City could justifiably be used as a representative comparator for Mahon, given it peripheral location within Cork City, its much smaller scale and the far more limited public transport network coverage that would apply, as compared to Dublin City.

In the case of Tranch 2 (full build-out), assumed traffic impact has been based on the assumption that a 55% non-car mode share will be achieved, related to which, the BRT as proposed in CATS would be in place, delivering a 3-5 minute service frequency during the peak periods. The 55% assumption appears to be based on the 'Smarter Travel' policy objective, in combination with the same Dublin City-derived rather than on a model-based output. Further explanation is required on how this mode split would be achieved.

A reduced Tranch 2 build out (30%) is proposed, in the absence of BRT. Again, greater clarity is required on what trip distribution, mode split and associated traffic impact assumptions relate to this development scenario.

Greater clarity is required on what impact transport demand management measures such as restricted parking standards and area-based mobility management are likely to have on modal split for employment related trips. On this issue of parking standards, these standards applicable have not been specified in the TTA nor has the manner in which they would be applied. In any case, the ability to deliver a reduced standard would appear to be contingent on decisions which are beyond the scope of the LAP, i.e. reference to Metropolitan-wide parking standards.

Under Tranch 1, an increase in traffic volumes on the N40 of 4% and 2%, west and east of the Mahon Interchange has been assumed and is described as having a marginal traffic impact. The further impact of development associated with Tranch 2 being described as being insignificant. It is not clear from the TTA, how these assumptions relate to the future year performance of the interchange.

Employment Ratios

Population to Employment Ratio Issue (as referenced on p.31 of TTA)

Clarification of the ratios set out in section 4.3.8 of the Mahon TTA

In relation to the ratios in section 4.3.8, the 0.33 figure is derived from an analysis of the number of jobs in major suburban employment locations which are filled by local labour force, that it, in an area with say, 5,000 jobs, 1,650 of them are likely to be taken up locally. The other two thirds of the local labour force would therefore travel to other employment destinations. This figure therefore is not related to the ratio of local jobs to local population.

The 0.5 figure would be more applicable to be used as a jobs : labour force ratio, rather than as a jobs : population ratio as the latter would roughly imply a ratio of unity between local labour force and local employment. This would not be the case in most suburban locations. It is noted that Mahon is one of two suburban key development areas within the City Council area and as such, it is a matter of policy for the local authority to determine what implications this has for the ratio of population to employment under a preferred land use option. The data from Dublin shows a fairly wide variation in this regard depending on mainly the scale and nature of employment planned.

Overall, the NTA would like to clarify that the ratios do not compromise "guidance" from the NTA, informal or otherwise, in terms of good planning policy, rather we have merely provided data from the 2006 Census which the City Council can choose to use as a guide or not in planning for the Mahon area. This will be determined by the Council's own vision for Mahon, whether it should be a suburban location with employment at the local scale or a major economic node to which people will travel from the wider Metropolitan Area to work every day.

In terms of the paragraph in the document we would recommend that it is altered to read along the lines of the following:

"Table 4-7 sets out the population: employment ratio for Mahon from the 2006 Census. Data from select suburban areas in Dublin indicate a range from 0.24 to 0.54 generally. It is the policy of the City Council that the ratio for the Mahon area as defined would be 0.xx:1."

NOTES

NRA Comments

- No detailed analysis of the Mahon N40 Interchange – a serious issue, given existing capacity constraints
- Re. point that *'LU Option 3 will have negative impact on Mahon Interchange even if mode split targets are achieved, although this impact will be marginal'*, it has not been explained on what basis the impact has been determined as *'marginal'*
 - Re. %age traffic increases on the N40 associated with LU Option 3, it is not clear whether these relate to AADT or Peak Hour
 - In light of this issue, it is even more crucial that a detailed analysis be undertaken of the impacts on the Mahon Interchange/ N40 or existing land uses and the various LU options being considered
 - No meaningful mitigation measures proposed re. management of traffic at the Mahon Interchange
 - More generally, re. all national road junctions in the Metropolitan Area, the impact of development generated traffic must be managed so as to reduce impact on strategic movements
 - Based on presumption of continued dominance of car-based orbital movements, there is a need to provide strengthened public transport choice on existing orbital routes and along key desire lines linking designated development areas in the north and SE of the Metropolitan area
 - Reference to the NRA's support of this objective, through its investment/ planned investment in upgrading junctions on the N40 and through involvement in TDM-oriented studies such as the N28 Study with its emphasis on MMPing on the N28 (ref. Bloomfield I/C) and Cork Science & Innovation Park (ref. Curraheen I/C)
- Conclusion – NRA still remains to be convinced that the focus for development in the area surrounding the Mahon I/C will not be excessively dependent on the use of the private car and the provision of access to the national road network.

OS Comment on the NRA's N40/ Orbital Movements point

I don't think that further capacity increases at interchanges on the N40 is going to affect a modal shift to public transport for orbitally-based movements generally, including those using the N40 corridor, even if more bus services were to be provided (itself outside the remit of local authorities). Further capacity increases (and associated reductions in journey times for orbital trips by car, using the N40) would probably confer an even greater competitive advantage on the car over the use of public transport, even if those same reductions in journey times/ increases in journey time reliability were to allow for more reliable bus services along this route.

The key to this argument lies with the willingness or otherwise to embrace transport demand management, both in the management of the N40 Corridor/ the national road network generally

and through a range of 'destination' measures which focus both on reducing the level of provision for the car and promoting/ enabling the provision and use of alternative modes.

In this regard, both the NRA and the two local authorities need to clarify their positions in regard to the matter of TDM on the N40 and other parts of the national road network within the Metropolitan Area. Are they in favour of TDM/ Corridor Management or not and if so, what measures do they have in mind? If there are constraints to the introduction of such objective-led TDM, what are they and what solutions/ level of implementation/ type of implementation might be possible, and by which agency/ agencies?

Whilst raising concerns about the location of trip-intensive and large scale development next to national road interchanges may be understandable and supportable, doing so in the absence of a coherent and clearly stated position on *the other half of the equation* (transport demand management) is not particularly productive.

Other Remarks re. TDM and current government policy (*Development and National Roads*)

If it's intended to incorporate 'refined' policies and objectives formulated during the preparation of the Mahon LAP into the subsequent review of the City Development Plan, policy areas most appropriately formulated at a strategic level such as TDM should not be led by policy formulation at LAP level, as the more localised the focus in dealing with TDM, the more narrowly focused it is going to be (the extreme case being the MMP typically appended to planning application TIA). In a case where the main focus of the LAP is to validate the provision of further trip intensive and large scale development adjacent to a national road interchange, such a locally focused approach is not appropriate, leading as it would to a greater chance of such development being validated and a more narrowly focused and piecemeal approach being taken to TDM, ultimately resulting in policy failure and non-compliance with government policy as it relates to *Spatial Planning and National Roads* (see pages 21-22).

Mahon TTA

- **Study Objectives**
 - Based on DoT Guidelines (5 key categories)
- **Key Project Indicators (KPIs)**
 - 17 indicators under the 5 key study objectives
- **Policy Context**
 - Development within the district centre to achieve more urban format and broader mix of uses, higher densities, reduced surface parking, street frontage development, layout reconfiguration
 - Higher densities and appropriate supporting infrastructure
 - High standard of urban design
 - Avoid undermining the potential of the wider area

- Employment growth to linked to overall Cork City Employment Strategy/ CASP Update 2008
 - c.50% of employment growth to be allocated to City Centre and Inner Docklands
 - c.50% of employment growth to be allocated equally to Outer Docklands, Blackpool and Mahon
 - Employment growth above CASP targets must be linked to provision of BRT and associated need to provide sufficient transport demand (for BRT)
 - Reference to relative strengths of Mahon as compared with other existing strategic employment sites outside of the City (re. accessibility and location within core area of Cork Gateway)
 - TDM
 - Strict new car parking standards will be enforced
 - Based on/ contingent on? introduction of standardised Metropolitan Area car parking standards
 - Implementation of AWMMP for all employment sites
- **Key Development Areas**
 - Mahon Ind est
 - Bessboro House
 - Major residential development
 - Lough Mahon Technology Park
 - Remains in employment use
 - Mahon Point
 - **3 no. land use options**
 - 2 no. tranches
 - To 2021
 - 2021-2031
 - Preferred LU option (Option 3)
 - **Assessment methodology (Mahon Area Traffic Model) AM & PM Peak**
 - Common Appraisal Framework (DoT) – Study Objectives
 - Matrices - Census data for trip rates, trip types and mode splits ('06 SAPS, POWCAR)
 - Average household size
 - Employment densities by LU
 - CASP SATURN Traffic Model
 - Mode share adjustment based on Census data & LU distribution
 - Model testing of 3 no. LU options for FY (2021)
 - Evaluation of performance through KPI framework (agreed KPI's)
 - Selection of Preferred LU option (Option 3)
 - Future Year (2031) test of Option 3
 - Evaluation of performance of preferred option through KPI framework

- Strategic High Infrastructure Intervention tests on Preferred Option
- Recommended LU and Infrastructure (preferred option) for 2021 & 2031
- *Population Targets derived from employment targets (CCDP 2009-15 and CASP Update), based on target employment/population ratio*

- **Recommended LU Strategy (Option 3)**

- Option 3 (Zoned modular approach – new residential neighbourhoods + consolidated commercial core)
 - densification
 - Shorter trips
 - Greater propensity to use non-car modes
 - Marginal impact on the N40 in 2021, becoming negligible in 2031
 - 4% and 2% increase in traffic on N40 (w+e of I/C) in 2021
 - Significant supporting p.t. & walking/ cycling
 - Does not require significant highway infrastructure investment in the longer term
 - Likely to be an attractive LU option to the market
 - Will require a step-change in level of p.t. service provision, equivalent to those identified in CATS
 - Tranch 2 is contingent on a 55% non-car mode share being achieved
 - BRT (3-5 minute peak-period service frequencies in Mahon area)
 - In the absence of BRT, Tranch 2 quantum to be reduced to 30% of total
 - Significant improvements in walking/ cycling
 - Proposed Supporting Transportation Infrastructure
 - Bessborough Bridge of Passage Railway Line
 - Link from SC to Estuary Road
 - Bus lanes on Mahon Link Road
 - Bus gate between SC and St Michael's Drive and bus lane linking to Mahon Link Road
 - Bus lane on Skehard (without reducing gen. veh. capacity)
 - Bus route to bus gate via St. Michael's Drive
 - Left turn slip from SC to N40 SRR?
 - Other relevant transportation infrastructure
 - Mahon – C.C. Green Route (in conjunction with Docklands Dev't)
 - Skehard Road upgrade from Silverdale Drive
 - BRT (feasibility study underway)
 - TDM
 - Recommendation that AWMMP be adopted and implemented by all employers
 - Monitoring of Traffic

Policy Context for further large scale development adjacent to a national primary road interchange

The consideration of further significant development, particularly retail and commercial development in a location like Mahon presents particular challenges in regards to the following:

- Demonstrating that the scale of development and mix of uses proposed is consistent with current government policy (Spatial Planning and National Roads – Guidelines for Planning Authorities, January 2012).
- Achieving greater consolidation of the Cork Gateway's population and employment growth within Cork City in locations and in a manner which supports the greater use of non-car modes, reduces car dependency and prioritises