

An
Bord
Pleanála

Board Direction
BD-019417-25
ABP-318902-24

The submissions on this file and the Inspector's report were considered at a Board meeting held on 04/04/2025.

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

Reasons and Considerations

1. Having regard to Section 5.10.2 of Volume 2 of the Wexford County Development Plan 2022-2028 which states that no further bulky goods retail parks are considered to be required, Objective WXC17 of the Wexford Retail Strategy 2021-2027 in Volume 8 of the said plan where there is a presumption against out-of-town warehousing, and the existing retail parks in the area, it is considered that the proposed development of 5 no. comparison bulky goods retail warehousing units, would lead to a predominance of retail warehousing in the area which would not be in accordance with the provisions of the development plan. The proposed development would, therefore, be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.
2. Having regard to the Sustainable Urban Design Standards for New Apartments Guidelines for Planning Authorities 2023 it is considered that the design and layout of the proposed mixed-use block which includes 10 no. apartments would lead to a substandard form of residential development, lacking in the provision of public and communal open space and appropriate bin storage facilities. Furthermore, it is considered that the access arrangements for residents via a retail car park and outlook of the south facing apartments onto the car park would not constitute a high quality living environment and as such would be


contrary to Objective SH02 of the Wexford County Development Plan 2022-2028 which aims, inter alia, to ensure that all new residential developments provide a high quality living environment with attractive and efficient buildings which are located in a high quality public realm. As such, the proposed development would be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

Notes:

- (i) The Board noted the inspector's second recommended reason for refusal in relation to the potential adverse impact of the proposed development on the emerging design of the transport network in the area and on the improvements required at the junction with Whitemill Road to the northwest of the site. However, having regard to the entirety of the information on file, including the recommendation of the planning authority's Roads Department, and the proposed setback of the mixed use building by 3m as indicated on the drawings submitted with the appeal, the Board did not consider that the development as proposed would be premature or would endanger public safety by reason of traffic hazard and therefore did not consider that this constituted a reason for refusal.
- (ii) The Board noted the inspector's third recommended reason for refusal in relation to surface water and wastewater arrangements. Based on the information on file the Board considered the proposed wastewater arrangements to be satisfactory. The Board considered that while measures to incorporate SUDS into the development could be improved on, this could have been dealt with by condition in the event of a grant of permission and was not a reason for refusal in itself.
- (iii) The Board considered that having regard to the overall layout and design of the proposed mixed use development, the creation of a new bulky goods retail area unconnected to the existing adjoining retail areas, the access arrangements for residents in the proposed apartments, and access arrangements for residents of nearby developments to avail of the

mixed retail facilities, that the overall design of the development did not provide a high quality of placemaking or serve to develop a high quality community neighbourhood. While ordinarily this would warrant further consideration and a request for further information, in this instance given the substantive reasons for refusal above, it was decided not to pursue these matters under the current appeal.

Board Member



Mary Gurrle

Date: 24/04/2025