



An  
Bord  
Pleanála

## Record of Meeting ABP-300163-17

<b>Case Reference / Description</b>	142 no. houses, new vehicular access, landscaping and associated site works. Mount Avenue, Farrandreg, Dundalk, Co. Louth.		
<b>Case Type</b>	Section 5 Pre-Application Consultation Request		
<b>1<sup>st</sup>/2<sup>nd</sup>/3<sup>rd</sup> Meeting</b>	1 <sup>st</sup> Meeting		
<b>Date:</b>	7 <sup>th</sup> December, 2017	<b>Start Time</b>	11.15 am
<b>Location</b>	Office of Louth County Council	<b>End Time</b>	12.45 pm
<b>Chairperson</b>	Tom Rabbette	<b>Executive Officer</b>	Cora Cunningham

### Representing An Bord Pleanála:

Tom Rabbette, Assistant Director of Planning
Joanna Kelly, Senior Planning Inspector
Cora Cunningham, Executive Officer

### Representing Prospective Applicant:

Stephen Ward, Stephen Ward Town Planning & Development Consultants Limited
Bronagh Clarke, Stephen Ward Town Planning & Development Consultants Limited
Jan Van Dijk, Van Dijk Architects
Joe Gibbons, Waterman Moylan Consulting Engineers

### Representing Planning Authority

Anthony Abbot King, Senior Planner
David Hall, Executive Planner
Frank Magee, Senior Executive Engineer
Pat Finn, Senior Engineer
Sinead Mullen, Senior Executive Planner

Apologies from Laurence Goodman (Prospective Applicant)

### **Introduction**

The representatives of An Bord Pleanála (ABP) welcomed the prospective applicant, Planning Authority (PA) and introductions were made. 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 1<sup>st</sup> December, 2017 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 13<sup>th</sup> October, 2017 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. Mount Avenue road upgrade**
- 2. Traffic and access**
- 3. Development strategy to include layout, open space, accessibility, connectivity, phasing and integration with adjoining lands**
- 4. Surface water management**
- 5. Any other matters**

## **1. Mount Avenue road upgrade**

### **ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:**

- Previous proposals refused by ABP and justification required in pre-application regarding proposed development
- Details submitted in pre-application consultation unclear as to the extent of works to be carried out, unable to access Part 8 proposals, LIHAF funding for site
- Timing of road upgrade works should be clearly shown in application and should show road upgrade will carry the traffic generated from proposed development
- Application documentation to show who will deliver road upgrade and timelines involved, possible occupancy condition on houses pending delivery of road

### **Prospective Applicant's response:**

- Part 8 covers an area from Carrick Road to Castletown Road
- 5-year permission for proposed development
- Sightlines on previous planning application not achieved, PA have acquired lands to west which will achieve sightlines without removal of stone wall/trees or need to acquire 3<sup>rd</sup> party lands
- Works on this section of road would be prioritised to provide safe road, upgrade of road to take place in tandem with proposed development, upgrade on northern section will allow full delivery of units
- Traffic and Transportation Assessment has been completed to be submitted with application

### **Planning Authority's comments:**

- Application under LIHAF funding, lands acquired LIHAF funding to facilitate house building in the area
- Part 8 not submitted with PA Opinion
- Part 8 will address junction; other work proposed under the scheme

## **2. Traffic and access**

### **ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:**

- Have both estates been taken in charge where access to proposed development is being provided, both access roads into development lead to cul de sac
- Provision in development plan for mobility management plan where 500+ trips generated by a development
- Need to demonstrate in application how development is DMURS compliant, order of priority in street design, road movement and hierarchy, connected streets – how vehicular permeability is achieved
- Part 8 accesses to be shown in application drawings and show overall integrated view of roads
- Application should address constraints on site and reference section 28 Ministerial Guidelines

### **Prospective Applicant's response:**

- Site contains varying levels hence no connectivity, pedestrian/cycle linkages thorough site

**Planning Authority's comments:**

- Part 8 for this section yet to be confirmed, Part 8 all tied into LIHAF funding, PA have to provide social housing in this area
- Application drawings should illustrate levels and show cross sections or 3D computer generated images
- Previous refusal from Board related to central open space and therefore may have caused this proposed layout

**3. Development strategy to include layout, open space, accessibility, connectivity, phasing and integration with adjoining lands**

**ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:**

- Details required in relation to Mount Avenue Masterplan and if development is or is not consistent with it
- Proposed layout not overly different from what was previously refused by ABP
- Open space is fragmented, planning application should show planning rationale as to how this will be provided
- Application to show rationale for houses on adjoining estate backing onto open space, address the reasons and uses of open space
- Open space needs to be revisited, integration with houses, uses and movement through site
- Protected view from the west need to be addressed in application
- Phasing needs to be clear and shown relative to Mount Avenue upgrade
- Traffic calming to be addressed and how this can be achieved on site
- Need for more robust planning argument in relation to density on site, density is below national standards, constraints on site need to be addressed in relation to density, no apartments included in proposed development

**Prospective Applicant's response:**

- Location of open space due to archaeological features on site
- Open space provides unexpected vista to the east across the site
- Development plan provides for 14% open space, constraints on site results in 20-22% open space provision
- Application to provide description as to the nature and function of the open space
- No demand for apartments

**Planning Authority's comments:**

- Density issues relate to typography of site

**4. Surface water management**

**ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:**

- All technical details need to be addressed and agreed with PA prior to lodging application as there is no provision for further information requests in the SHD process
- Details to be provide in application to show three catchment areas
- Soil type 2 to 3 needs to be justified

- Attenuation areas need to be shown on drawings and proximity to protected area needs addressing and possibly moved, any deviations need to be dealt with in application, ensure adequate attenuation for storm events

**Planning Authority's comments:**

- Attenuation needs to be robust system; discussions have taken place with the prospective applicant

**5. Any Other Matters**

**ABP Comments:**

- Issues raised in DAU submission need to be addressed in application (relating to archaeology)
- Overhead power lines need to be indicated in drawings where they traverse site
- Clarity sought on the status of the Dundalk Development Plan

**Prospective Applicant's comments:**

- Masterplan taken into consideration when preparing statement of consistency
- Will expand on justification in application in relation to density on site

**Planning Authority's comments:**

- The review of the Dundalk Development Plan has been held over pending the review of the County Development Plan

**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](mailto: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](mailto:spatialplanning@water.ie)

---

Tom Rabbette  
Assistant Director of Planning  
December, 2017