



Board Direction

Ref: PL09.246076

The submissions on this file and the Inspector's report were considered at a Board meeting held on 31st May 2016. The Board decided to refuse permission generally in accordance with the Inspector's recommendation, and in accordance with the draft reasons and considerations set out below.

REASONS AND CONSIDERATIONS

The submissions made in connection with the planning application and appeal identify part of the site as being subject to flooding. In the absence of a detailed site-specific flood risk assessment that would clearly identify the areas affected to inform the design of the proposed development, the Board is not satisfied that the proposed development would not itself be at risk of flooding, or that it would not give rise to an increased risk of flooding in the area. It is considered that the proposed development would, therefore, be contrary to the provisions of the "Planning System and Flood Risk Management - Guidelines for Planning Authorities" (2009) and would be prejudicial to public health. Furthermore, the Board considered that the extent of development within an area designated as "Open Space and Amenity", including car parking, roads and other ancillary development, would be contrary to the zoning objective, which seeks "to protect and provide for recreation, open space and amenity provision", and whereby development that would result in a loss of open space will not normally be permitted. The proposed development would, therefore, be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

Note:

1. While welcoming the proposal to apply DMURS, the Board has concerns that the particular design proposals, having a multiplicity of entrances off the orbital road serving the town of Maynooth, would compromise the carrying capacity of a strategic route and would result in traffic and pedestrian hazard. While emphasising place-making, DMURS also recognises that there are some roads which are required to cater for the efficient movement of larger volumes of motorised traffic, including inner relief roads that are designed to divert traffic within an urban area, such as this one. It is considered that, in applying DMURS, and achieving integration into the urban fabric, greater consideration would be required in respect of the intended higher order traffic function of this particular street. DMURS indicates that successful solutions for inner relief roads tend to be designed as boulevards. The Board notes that such an approach has broadly been taken with respect to Houses 1 – 17, for example, having development facing on to the orbital route, but with a limited number of direct accesses. The Board also notes the examples of Urban Boulevard Street typologies given in Figure 3.34 of DMURS. This matter should be fully addressed in any future application.

2. The Board has serious concerns in relation to the layout of the proposed development, which does not make best use of clustering around open space generally and, in particular, results in a negative approach to secondary areas of open space that are frequently faced by gable ends. The open spaces bounded by Houses 23, 24, 96 and 129 and by Houses 155 and 163 (which is confined by gables and rear garden walls except at the far end) are particularly poor examples (as set out in Drawing 05.171.FI201 submitted to the planning authority on 10th November 2015). Any future application should better address open space generally, including development facing the major open spaces, and should examine in particular the provision of or necessity for poorly designed secondary open space, also having regard to the substantial areas zoned Open Space and Amenity.

Please issue a copy of this Direction with the Board Order.

Board Member: _____ Date: 31st May 2016
Fionna O' Regan