

Board Direction BD-002338-19 ABP-302922-18

The submissions on this file and the Inspector's report were considered at a Board meeting held on February 12th 2019.

The Board decided to refuse permission, generally in accordance with the Inspector's recommendation, for the following reasons and considerations.

Reasons and Considerations

1. It is considered that the proposed design strategy for the overall development, and in particular the scale, mass and design of the apartment building at the entrance to the development, and also the design, layout and unit mix of the housing units proposed, does not provide an acceptable design solution having regard to the site's locational context. The design of the proposed apartment block is considered to be an inappropriate design response to the site, given its locational context, which requires a building of much greater architectural quality than that proposed. It is considered that the arrangement and overall design of the apartment scheme is monolithic with repetitive proportions and an unrefined palette of materials. In addition, it is dominated by car parking and lacks proximate usable open space. Furthermore, the "Urban Design Manual – a Best Practice Guide" issued by the Department of the Environment, Heritage and Local Government (2009), to accompany the Guidelines for Planning Authorities on Sustainable Residential Development in Urban Areas includes key criteria such as context, connections, inclusivity, variety and distinctiveness. It is considered that the overall residential development results in a poor design concept and layout that is unimaginative and substandard in its form, scale and layout and fails to provide a hierarchy of high quality usable open spaces. In addition, the proposal fails to establish a sense of place and includes a poor quality of architectural design and limited palette of materials to the proposed units and apartment block which would result in a substandard form of development lacking in variety and distinctiveness. Furthermore, the urban edge proposed to the south of the site lacks architectural quality, variety and sense of place. The proposed development would, therefore, be contrary to these Ministerial Guidelines which promote innovative and qualitative design solutions, and would be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

- 2. The Board is not satisfied, on the basis of the information submitted in respect of surface water management on the site and flood risk that the documentation received, both drawings and accompanying reports, is sufficiently detailed, is consistent and incorporates satisfactory SuDS measures to facilitate a comprehensive examination of the storm water proposals for the proposed development. Furthermore, it is considered that the flood risk report submitted is not sufficiently comprehensive nor does it comply with the requirements of the Flood Risk Guidelines entitled 'The Planning System and Flood Risk Management' (including the associated 'Technical Appendices'). The Board cannot be satisfied, therefore, that the proposed development would not lead to a risk of flooding, including flood risk to third party properties and lands, and cannot be satisfied that the development would not be prejudicial to public health. In the absence of certainty in relation to these matters, the proposed development would, therefore, be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.
- 3. It is considered that the proposed Link Street does not meet the design requirements for a link street in accordance with Objective SRO 5(b) of the Newbridge Local Area Plan 2013 – 2019. The design of the proposed street exhibits multiple road safety hazards, through the proliferation of domestic entrances along this route where cars must either reverse in or out, through impeded sight lines due to the likelihood of on-street car parking, and as a

result of poorly designed traffic calming measures that fail to comply with the principles set out in the Design Manual for Urban Roads and Street (2013), and in particular the protection of vulnerable road users such as pedestrians. Furthermore, this Link Street as identified in the Local Area Plan will be required to be delivered through to Green Road in the future and a new junction constructed at this location, however, the proposed development may render this unviable due to improper design. Accordingly, the proposed development would be contrary to Objective 5 (b) of the Newbridge Local Area Plan 2013 – 2019, would endanger public safety by reason of traffic hazard, including hazard to vulnerable road users such as pedestrians, and would, therefore, be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

Note: In reaching its decision, the Board noted the lack of any provision for a crèche, notwithstanding the number of units proposed, and the proportion of those units (80%) that are family-type units of 3 or 4 bedrooms. The Board did not find the Social Impact Assessment submitted by the applicant to be convincing, and noted the detailed analysis of this document provided as part of the observation of the residents of Ballymany Manor Housing estate by the group's consultant. The Board therefore considered that any future proposal for residential development on these lands should include provision for childcare, but decided not to include this aspect as a further reason for refusal, in the light of the substantive reasons for refusal set out above.

[Please issue a copy of this Direction with the Board Order to the parties.]

Board Member

Date: 12th February 2019

Philip Jones