

**DRAFT DIRECTION IN THE MATTER OF SECTION 31
OF THE PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT ACT 2000 (as amended)**

Monaghan County Development Plan 2025-2031

“Development Plan” means the Monaghan County Development Plan 2025-2031 (as made).

“Planning Authority” means Monaghan County Council.

“RSES” means the Regional Spatial and Economic Strategy for the Northern and Western Region.

“NPF” means the National Planning Framework First Revision (2025).

The Minister for Housing, Local Government and Heritage in exercise of the powers conferred on him by section 31 of the Planning and Development Act 2000 (No.30 of 2000) ("the Act") and consequent to a recommendation made to him by the Office of the Planning Regulator, hereby directs as follows:

(1) This Direction may be cited as the Planning and Development (Monaghan County Development Plan 2025-2031) Direction 2025.

(2) The Planning Authority is hereby directed to take the following steps with regard to the Development Plan:

(a) Delete the following Material Alterations from the adopted Development Plan:

(i) **MA: Chapter 9, No.2** - i.e. the footnote at table 9.3 Land Use Zoning Matrix which states ‘Retail (Convenience) and Retail (Comparison) are acceptable in principle at the Monaghan Retail Park’.

(ii) **MA: MTDP1 No.15** - i.e. that portion of the subject lands within Flood Zone A reverts to the zoning objective in the draft Plan i.e. from Industry / Enterprise / Employment to Landscape Protection / Conservation.

(b) Apply all necessary consequential updates to the text of the plan consistent with the foregoing.

STATEMENT OF REASONS

I. The Development Plan includes a material alteration to the draft County Development Plan to insert a footnote at table 9.3, Land Use Zoning Matrix which states 'Retail (Convenience) and Retail (Comparison) are acceptable in principle at the Monaghan Retail Park'. The location of the Monaghan Retail Park at a distance of approximately 1.5 km from the core retail area and outside the CSO boundary does not support the regeneration and rejuvenation of the town centre or the location of retail in town centres, and does not facilitate linked trips but rather, due to its location, will likely generate additional car-based rather than pedestrian or cycle trips for convenience and comparison retailing. The material alteration is therefore inconsistent with NPO 14 of the NPF to regenerate and rejuvenate towns, NPO 107 to support the delivery of the National Strategic Outcomes of the NPF relating to compact growth, sustainable mobility and the transition to a carbon neutral and climate resilient society, RPO 4.45 of the RSES to support retail in town centres, and section 10(2)(n) of the Act which requires objectives (which the planning authority has a general duty to secure under section 15 of the Act) for the promotion of sustainable settlement and transportation strategies, including the promotion of specific measures having regard to the location of development.

II. The Development Plan includes a material alteration (MA: MTDP1 No.15) to the draft County Development Plan to amend the zoning objective of land located in Flood Zone A from Landscape Protection / Conservation to Industry / Enterprise / Employment in circumstances where the Planning System and Flood Risk Management Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2009) (Flood Guidelines), issued under section 28 of the Act, indicate that such uses are not appropriate unless a Justification Test is passed. As the Justification Test has not been passed, the material alteration is therefore inconsistent with NPO 78 of the NPF which requires the planning authority to avoid inappropriate development in areas at risk of flooding that do not pass the Justification Test in accordance with the Flood Guidelines; and RPO 3.10 of the RSES to ensure flood risk management informs development by avoiding inappropriate development in areas at risk of flooding and to assess flood risk by implementing the recommendations of the Flood Guidelines.

III. No or no adequate reasons relating to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area have been provided to explain why it was not practicable for the Planning Authority to implement the objectives of the NPF and the RSES, or how, notwithstanding this inconsistency with the NPF and RSES, the Development Plan sets out an overall strategy for the proper and sustainable development of the area.

IV. The Development Plan has not been made in a manner consistent with, and has failed to implement recommendations of the Office of the Planning Regulator made under section 31AM of the Act.

V. The Minister is of the opinion that the Development Plan is not consistent with the above-mentioned objectives of the NPF and the RSES, and fails to set out an overall strategy for the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

VII. The Development Plan is not in compliance with the requirements of the Act.

GIVEN under my Official Seal,

Minister for Housing, Local Government and Heritage

Day of Month, Year.