



Case Reference / Description	413 no. residential units (182 no. houses, 205 no. apartments), childcare facility and associated site works. Carcur Park, Wexford.		
Case Type	Section 5 Pre-Application Consultation Request		
Date:	17 th June, 2020	Start Time	10.00 am
Location	Via Microsoft Teams	End Time	11.00 am
Chairperson	Stephen O'Sullivan	Senior Executive Officer	Cora Cunningham

Representing An Bord Pleanála:

Stephen O'Sullivan, Assistant Director Planning
Fiona Fair, Senior Planning Inspector
Cora Cunningham, Senior Executive Officer

Representing Prospective Applicant:

Ian Doyle, Ian Doyle Planning Consultant
Seamus Neville, Applicant
Arthur Murphy, Arthur Murphy and Company
Mark Kennedy, Reddy A+U

Representing Planning Authority

Sean Kavanagh, Senior Executive Engineer
Brendan Cooney, Senior Executive Scientist
James Lavin, Senior Executive Planner
Liam Bowe, Executive Planner

Introduction

The representatives of An Bord Pleanála (ABP) welcomed the prospective applicant, Planning Authority (PA) via Microsoft Teams having regard to the Covid-19 virus.

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 8th May, 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 16th March, 2020 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. Response to Previous Refusal Reasons on foot of ABP-304066-19:-

- **Proposals to drain surface water from the site**
- **Details for surface water attenuation designed in accordance with SuDs guidelines**
- **Clarify the requirement for a Surface Water Discharge licence to groundwater**
- **Surface Water Discharge licence if required to be submitted with the application**
- **Demonstrate that Flood Risk and residual Flood Risk has been dealt with, regard being had to the justification test set out in section 5.15 of the Guidelines for Planning Authorities on the Planning System and Flood Risk Management, Nov 2009**
- **Identify and describe the extensive infill works and groundworks that are proposed. Clarification of quantity and description of infill material to be imported in order to deal with the issue of flood risk**
- **The feasibility of a Foreshore Licence which would permit the discharge of treated surface water into the estuary**

2. **Connection Agreements with Irish Water**
3. **Design and Layout (strong corner units, adequate privacy strips around ground floor apartments, cycle Provision)**
4. **Levels across the site arising from proposed access over the railway bridge and possible future bridge over the Slaney regard being had to FFL of proposed Apartment Blocks 2 and 3 and Main Boulevard access through the site**
5. **Traffic Impact Assessment and Road Safety Audit**
6. **Response to Planning Authority Report dated 8th May 2020 and Issues Raised**
7. **Any Other Matters**

1. Response to Previous Refusal Reasons on foot of ABP-304066-19

ABP Comments:

- Refusal on proposed site for similar development, 2 reasons for refusal, repeat application
- Infill to be set out in EIAR
- ABP must know what work are proposed and their impacts before permission can be granted
- Detailed information needs to be set out in EIAR so ABP can assess procedurally
- Prospective applicant will need to consult with Department in relation to Foreshore Licence and address in application
- ABP raising that there may be 3rd party issues, better to detail in application
- Any discharge in relation to drainage should be agreed prior to lodging application as no further information request is permitted under SHD
- Issues raised previously cannot be dealt with under SHD
- More detail required for application
- Resolve matters with PA prior to lodging application

Prospective Applicant's Comments:

- Discharging to estuary rather than ground
- Flood Risk Assessment carried out
- Attenuation tanks proposed on site, 5 discharge points into estuary
- Importing soil which will be tested, will address in application
- EIAR will be revised prior to lodging application
- Proposed development doesn't need surface water discharge licence, Department states permission required before licence will be issued
- Similar development granted permission in proximity to site

Planning Authority's Comments:

- PA asked prospective applicant in section 247 meetings to consult with agencies, PA will have to accept Departments advice
- PA have issue with drainage to estuary
- More detail and further discussions required in order to prevent foul matter being discharged into estuary
- Soakpit not sustainable on site, PA prefer discharge to estuary

2. Connection Agreements with Irish Water

ABP Comments:

- Addressed issues raised in Irish Water submission

Prospective Applicant's Comments:

- Will discuss further with Irish Water

Planning Authority's Comments:

- Irish Water separate utility, prospective applicant should reach agreement with Irish Water

3. Design and Layout (strong corner units, adequate privacy strips around ground floor apartments, cycle provision)

ABP Comments:

- Application identical to previously permitted, need for high quality design and layout
- Ensure drawings are legible in application documentation
- Address matters raised previously
- Have regard to National Cycle Manual which sets out cycle provision
- Inclusion of riverside walk would raise significant issues in application including Appropriate Assessment

Prospective Applicant's Comments:

- Layout is as previously applied for, PA supportive of proposals
- Some house types are dual aspect, will ensure corner units of apartments are dual aspect
- Will ensure application drawings legible, elevations/sections included in relation to apartments
- Cycle provision will be included in Housing Quality Assessment
- PA also have comments in relation to layout proposed
- Cycle provisions proposed on main arterial route, will have regard to National Cycle Manual
- Will include dedicated chapter in Design and Assess Statement in relation to pedestrian and cycle provision
- Road Safety Audit address parking
- Electric vehicle charging points detailed on drawings
- Ground floor units designed to be convertible into retail or office use
- PA refer to riverside walk, open space provision proposed along river which will link with any offsite development proposed by PA, not proposing riverside walk in this development
- Public open space in PA Opinion refers to riverside walk, will address in application

Planning Authority's Comments:

- Proposed development has gone through a number of alliterations
- Have regard to shared surfaces at entrance
- Need for high quality pedestrian and cycle provision including connections into town
- Clarify proposed parking coming to junctions

- Include electric vehicle charging points in proposed development
- Only 1 retail unit proposed, consider identifying additional units which may be converted for retail use, identify units for conversion on drawings
- PA raised issue of including riverside walk but not a secure route
- Riverside walk outside of proposed site would provide amenity walk to town centre

4. Levels across the site arising from proposed access over the railway bridge and possible future bridge over the Slaney regard being had to FFL of proposed Apartment Blocks 2 and 3 and Main Boulevard access through the site

ABP Comments:

- Above issues as a result of drawings submitted, difficult to read details, address in application
- Ensure all details are included in application documentation

Prospective Applicant's Comments:

- Acknowledge scale of drawings and issuing in detail being clearer
- Blocks 2 and 3 result from bridge, details in sections and 3-D, will ensure clarity in application
- Bridge over Slaney possibly provided in future

Planning Authority's Comments:

- All details have to be addressed in application

5. Traffic Impact Assessment and Road Safety Audit

ABP Comments:

- Road Safety Audit to be submitted
- Have regard to scale of site, possible issues in relation to traffic that may be raised in 3rd party submissions
- Urban site so Boulevard should follow DMURS, have regard to similar SHD applications in relation to DMURS
- DMURS caters for urban streets but with lower speeds

Prospective Applicant's Comments:

- Road Safety Audit submitted with previous application
- Will carry out additional road safety audit, clarification required in Stage 3/4 Road Safety Audit required

Planning Authority's Comments:

- Due to scale of proposed development Road Safety Audit should go beyond Stage 1, PA consider Stage 3/4 should be carried out
- Audit didn't include proposed bridge over Slaney and traffic that may come through core of development
- Can proposed development deal with this level of traffic and its impacts
- Bridge over Slaney included in Development Plan, bridge line has to be taken into consideration, may be difficult to incorporate into proposed development at later stage

- Prospective applicant should consider at least doing Stage 2 Road Safety Audit

6. Response to Planning Authority Report dated 8th May 2020 and Issues Raised

ABP Comments:

- Portion of site adjacent to historical landfill, have regard to gas monitoring

Prospective Applicant's Comments:

- Satisfied with issues raised in PA Opinion
- Details of public lighting submitted; this has been assessed by Ecologist
- Details of gas monitoring including mitigation measures submitted, this is acceptable to PA
- Gas monitoring will continue, will liaise further with PA, details will be included in EIAR

Planning Authority's Comments:

- Details of public lighting to be submitted
- Low risk site, gas migration low but may be problematic in future, mitigation measures acceptable to PA

7. Any other matters

ABP Comments:

- Ensure consistency across reports

Prospective Applicant's Comments:

- Documentation states density of 30, of arterial route removed density will be 40 approximately

Conclusion

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 **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

Stephen O'Sullivan
Assistant Director of Planning
June, 2020