



Planning and Development Acts 2000 to 2019

Planning Authority: Wexford County Council

Planning Register Reference Number: 20180818

APPEAL by James D., Joan and David Askins of “Hillgrange”, Carleysbridge, Enniscorthy, County Wexford against the decision made on the 8th day of February, 2019 by Wexford County Council to grant subject to conditions a permission to Torca Developments Limited care of McGill Planning, Chartered Town Planners of 1st Floor, Number 7 Fitzwilliam Street Upper, Dublin.

Proposed Development: Demolition of existing agricultural structures (circa 422 square metres). Construction of 97 number dwelling units comprising 40 number (two to four bedroom) semi-detached houses, 17 number (two to three bedroom) terraced houses/townhouses, 20 number (two bedroom) apartments and 20 number (three bedroom) duplexes with first floor rear north-east facing terraces. All units ranging in size from circa 73 square metres to circa 130 square metres arranged across two to three-storeys. Provision of a single storey crèche (circa 235 square metres). All associated site development works, services provision, underground foul pumping station, drainage, new vehicular/pedestrian accesses, car and bicycle parking, bin stores, open space, landscaping and boundary treatment works at a site of circa 6.091 hectares on lands located to the east of Carley’s Bridge,

Enniscorthy, E.D. Enniscorthy Rural, County Wexford. The subject site referred to as 'Site A' is bounded to the north-west by Carley's Bridge Road and to the north by dwellings fronting Carley's Bridge Road, to the south by agricultural land, to the north-east by the Urrin Valley residential estate and to the south-west and west by the River Urrin as revised by the further public notices received by the planning authority on the 16th day of January 2019. A planning application for residential development on the remainder of lands to the south-east known as 'Site B' is lodged concurrent to the subject application.

Decision

REFUSE permission for the above proposed development in accordance with the reasons and considerations set out below.

Matters Considered

In making its decision, the Board had regard to those matters to which, by virtue of the Planning and Development Acts and Regulations made thereunder, it was required to have regard. Such matters included any submissions and observations received by it in accordance with statutory provisions.

Reasons and Considerations

Having regard to the provisions of the Ministerial Guidelines, 'Sustainable Residential Development in Urban Areas, Guidelines for Planning Authorities' issued by the Department of Environment, Heritage and Local Government in May 2009, specifically paragraph 5.11 and Appendix A, and Urban Development and Building Heights', Guidelines for Planning Authorities issued

by the Department of Housing, Planning and Local Government in December 2018, specifically SPPR 4, it is considered that the net density of the proposed development, at this residentially zoned outer suburban site on the edge of a larger town, is excessively low and would be contrary to the Ministerial Guidelines and would, therefore, be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

It is considered that the proposed disposition of open space areas, including lands identified as fully enclosed (apart from maintenance access) to allow for existing foul line retention, is discordant and haphazard and, in conjunction with the positioning of proposed dwellings which back onto these areas, would constitute a poor quality and inefficient layout and would, therefore, be contrary to the Ministerial Guidelines, 'Sustainable Residential Development in Urban Areas, Guidelines for Planning Authorities' issued by the Department of Environment, Heritage and Local Government in May 2009, specifically paragraph 3.3 and Box 2: Best Practice Design Manual Criteria. The proposed development would, therefore, be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

It is considered that the proposed development would comprise a poor response to the potential of the site to provide a firm boundary to the southern growth of the town, which demands a high quality of design and layout, and would seriously injure the residential amenity of future occupants and would, therefore, be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

In deciding not to accept the Inspector's recommendation to grant permission, the Board considered that the piecemeal approach to the development of the overall landholding, whereby two similarly scaled, functionally connected and mutually interdependent housing schemes are concurrently proposed by the same applicant on adjoining sites, leads to unnecessary ambiguity in respect of phasing and public open space, and to the inefficient duplication of childcare facilities.

John Connolly
Member of An Bord Pleanála
duly authorised to authenticate
the seal of the Board

Dated this day of 2019