



An  
Bord  
Pleanála

## Record of Meeting ABP-306266-19

<b>Description</b>	199 no. houses and 128 no. apartments with a crèche and all associated site works. Charterschool Land, Manorlands 2 <sup>nd</sup> Division & Commons Td 7 <sup>th</sup> Division, Trim, Co. Meath.		
<b>Case Type</b>	Section 5 Pre-Application Consultation Request		
<b>Date:</b>	13 <sup>th</sup> February, 2020	<b>Start Time</b>	11:30am
<b>Location</b>	Offices of An Bord Pleanála	<b>End Time</b>	12:20pm
<b>Chairperson</b>	Tom Rabbette	<b>E.O.</b>	Hannah Cullen

### Representing An Bord Pleanála:

Tom Rabbette, Assistant Director of Planning
Erika Casey, Senior Planning Inspector
Hannah Cullen, Executive Officer

### Representing Prospective Applicant:

Nicky Casey, McGill Planning
Trevor Sadler, McGill Planning
John Keegan, Applicant
Ruth Jackson, Applicant
Gwen Tierney, Landmark Design
Mark Heslin, ORS Consulting Engineers

### Representing Planning Authority

Frank O'Donnell, EP
Billy Joe Padden, A/SEP
Alan Roger, AO
Adrian Santry, EE,
Paul Aspell, EE

## **Introduction**

The representatives of An Bord Pleanála (ABP) welcomed the prospective applicant, Planning Authority (PA) and introductions were made. The procedural matters relating to the meeting were as follows:

- The written record will be placed on the pre-application consultation file and will be made public, along with that file, should an application arise following the conclusion of this consultation process,
- ABP received a submission from the PA on **27<sup>th</sup> January, 2020**, providing the records of consultations held pursuant to section 247 and its written opinion of considerations related to proper planning and sustainable development that may have a bearing on ABP's decision,
- The consultation meeting will not involve a merits-based assessment of the proposed development,
- The meeting will focus on key site-specific issues at strategic overview level, and whether the documents submitted require further consideration and/or amendment in order to constitute a reasonable basis for an application,
- Key considerations will be examined in the context of the statutory development plan for the area and section 28 Ministerial Guidelines where relevant,
- A reminder that neither the holding of a consultation or the forming of an opinion shall prejudice ABP or the PA concerned in relation to any other of their respective functions under the Planning Acts or any other enactments and cannot be relied upon in the formal planning process or in legal proceedings.

The ABP representatives acknowledged the letter dated **20<sup>th</sup> December 2019**, formally requesting pre-application consultations with ABP. Prospective applicant advised of the need to comply with definition of SHD as set out in the Act of 2016, in relation to thresholds of development. It was also noted that the Inspector dealing with the pre-application consultation request would be different to who would deal with the application when it was submitted. Recording of the meeting is prohibited.

## **Agenda**

- 1. Principle of development** and compliance with provisions of the Trim Development Plan 2014 to 2020 and the draft County Development Plan 2020-2026.
- 2. Development strategy** with particular regard to design and treatment of apartments blocks and their interface with the Summerhill Road; quality of public realm; road hierarchy and compliance with DMURS; connections and permeability; phasing of development; SuDs.
- 3. Drainage** with particular regard to the comments from IW and Meath County Council Water Services Department.
- 4. Traffic and access**
- 5. Any other matters**

**1. Principle of development** and compliance with provisions of the Trim Development Plan 2014 to 2020 and the draft County Development Plan 2020-2026.

**ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:**

- Conflicting information in the PA Opinion and the draft County Development Plan regarding the core strategy household projections for Trim.
- There appears to be no capacity issues in relation to the proposed development.
- Clarity sought from MCC around master planning requirements for the site.
- Timing of lodgement of an application under provisions of current development plan.
- Noted the GI zoning and whether any other community uses had been considered for this area other than the crèche.
- Scope for more active recreational use/public open space land uses in the GI zoned area.

**PA Comments:**

- The up to date figures are in the Draft County Plan.
- Recognise Trim as a self-sustaining growth town.
- Would consider the proposal on its merit. Have no objection in principle to the quantum of development proposed.
- Under the current Trim Development Plan, there is a requirement to prepare a masterplan for the site.

**Prospective Applicants response:**

- Masterplan will be submitted with application.
- Identified a crèche would be a good use community facility.
- No ideas specifically identified through the meetings with the Planning Authority on what community facilities what could work in this scheme. However, would consider the matter further in terms of active recreational uses.

**Further ABP comments:**

- The facilities provided for the purposed scheme should serve a wider function.

**2. Development strategy** with particular regard to design and treatment of apartments blocks and their interface with the Summerhill Road; quality of public realm; road hierarchy and compliance with DMURS; connections and permeability; phasing of development; SuDs.

**ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:**

- Noted previously refused applications on design grounds.
- An appropriate urban frontage is a key element to the development.
- Narrowness of footpath adjoining proposed development, scope for improvement. Need for better interface between the development and the public realm.
- Value of the hedgerow separating site and main road. Noted that it may be preferable to remove to enhance the public realm.
- Value of open space serving the apartments in terms of usability and functionality. Open space strategy needs further consideration.
- Incorporation of hard and soft landscaping.
- Repetitive elevational treatment of apartment design.
- Photomontages do not demonstrate the quality of the materials proposed.
- Letters required for any works proposed outside the red line boundary from the Planning Authority or owner.
- Volume of car parking serving the creche.
- Noted lack of passive surveillance with boundary walls fronting streets in a number of locations throughout the development. Parallel roads should be omitted. Parking serving apartments needs further consideration.
- Good mix of house sizes proposed. Monotony however, in house design with lack of clear character areas.
- Apartments at 38% dual aspect. Should be at 50% min to ensure high quality at this location.
- SuDs documentation appears to be limited. More information will be needed at application stage.
- Clarity required around density percentage of the scheme excluding the apartments.
- Phasing of the development to be clarified at application stage.
- Scheme is not compliant with DMURS in a number of regards.

**PA comments:**

- Compliance with DMURS.
- Welcome the idea of removing the hedgerow and widening the road/footpath.
- Junctions not deemed sufficient.
- Visual impact of the car parking a concern.

**Prospective Applicants response:**

- Development must have regard to Trim's heritage and protection of the views surrounding it.
- Will take on board the issues regarding the footpath.
- Ecology issues in removing the hedgerow, no issue widening road. Will consider further.
- Stone, render and metal used as materials in the apartments, however, take on board comments and quality issues can be re-looked at. Further CGI's and photomontages will be prepared.
- At the north of the site want to encourage connectivity to the town.
- Scope to break up the variation in the houses, original idea was a unified theme throughout the development.
- Geotech Investigation carried out in 2008.
- Can look into green roofs/rain water harvesting.
- Density excluding the apartments is probably low 30's, overall >40.
- 2 phase scheme approach.

**Further ABP comments:**

- Demonstrate compliance with DMURS at application stage.
- Scope for creation of different character areas.
- Provide justification that the proposed development will comply with the 12 criteria set out in the Urban Design Manual.
- Boundary treatment is critical for this site.

**Further PA comments:**

- Ensure the design complies with the Greater Dublin Strategic Drainage Strategy (GDSDS).

**3. Drainage** with particular regard to the comments from IW and Meath County Council Water Services Department.

**ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:**

- Irish Water suggest further investigation required due to uncertainty regarding capacity of pump station.

**PA comments:**

- Some concerns regarding attenuation calculations.

- In principal happy with the drainage approach.

**Prospective Applicants response:**

- Early 2019 received similar correspondence from Irish Water detailing the issue of capacity. Further liaised with them and IW issued 2<sup>nd</sup> letter of feasibility where capacity issues had been resolved. Believe there may have been a miscommunication error.
- Will engage in further discussions with Irish Water to resolve any issues.

**Further ABP comments:**

- Ensure any further correspondence or details received from Irish Water are submitted at application stage and no outstanding technical issues.

**4. Traffic and access**

**ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:**

- Concerns raised by the Planning Authority and ensure these are addressed at application stage.

**PA comments:**

- Trip generation figures appear low.

**Prospective Applicants response:**

- Will liaise further with the Planning Authority.

**5. Any other matters**

**Further Applicants comments:**

- Querying the compliance of the dual aspect percentage of the current scheme.

**Further ABP comments:**

- Of the view the dual aspect percentage should be 50% or higher, especially in this proposed site where there are no constraints.

**Further PA comments:**

- Detail lands to be taken in charge at application stage.
- Address the issues mentioned in the Transport Departments report.

- Identify the two land use zonings clearly at application stage.

### **Conclusions:**

#### **The representatives of ABP emphasised the following:**

- The representatives of ABP emphasised the following:
- There should be no delay in making the planning application once the public notice has been published
- Sample notices, application form and procedures are available on the ABP website
- Irish Water would like prospective applicants to contact Irish Water at [cdsdesignqa@water.ie](mailto:cdsdesignqa@water.ie) **between the Pre-Application Consultation and Application stages**, to confirm details of their proposed development and their proposed design.
- The email address to which applicants should send their **applications** to Irish Water as a prescribed body is [spatialplanning@water.ie](mailto:spatialplanning@water.ie)

---

Tom Rabbette  
Assistant Director of Planning  
March, 2020