

# Record of Meeting ABP-300414-17

kar-a-a-k			
Case Reference / Description	164 no. residential units (156 no. houses, 8 no. apartments), crèche, 339 no. car parking spaces, 14 no. bicycle parking spaces, open space and all associated site works at The Paddocks residential scheme (reg. ref. 16/1013).  Morristownbiller and Station Road, Newbridge, Co. Kildare.		
Case Type	Section 5 Pre-Application Consultation Request		
1 <sup>st</sup> /2 <sup>nd</sup> /3 <sup>rd</sup> Meeting	1 <sup>st</sup> Meeting		
Date:	25 <sup>th</sup> January, 2018	Start Time	10.00 am
Location	Office of An Bord Pleanála	End Time	am
Chairperson	Rachel Kenny	Executive Officer	Cora Cunningham

# Representing An Bord Pleanála:

Rachel Kenny, Director of Planning		
Sarah Moran, Senior Planning Inspector		
Cora Cunningham, Executive Officer		

# **Representing Prospective Applicant:**

Trevor Sadler, McGill Planning
Paul Duignan, Architect
Paddy Kavanagh, Engineer
Gwen Tierney, Landscape
Shay White, Stennock Limited

# **Representing Planning Authority**

Liam McGree, Senior Planner		
George Willoughby, Senior Executive Engineer		
David Hall, Senior Executive Engineer		
David Creighton, A/Senior Archaeologist		

Brigid Loughlin, Heritage Officer	
Peter Black, Conservation Officer	

#### 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 12<sup>th</sup> January, 2018 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 7<sup>th</sup> December, 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

- Density, quantum and standard of residential development, open space provision, public realm, Newbridge Local Area Plan 2013-2019 Policy HL6, location of crèche, potential impacts associated with the railway line
- 2. Roads layout, connection to Station Road, DEMURS, traffic impacts
- 3. Foul and surface water drainage and flood risk assessment, in particular connection to the Upper Liffey Valley Regional Sewerage Scheme
- 4. Potential impacts on Morristownbiller House
- 5. Potential impacts on Pollardstown Fen SAC
- 6. Clarification of Part V proposals
- 7. Any other matters

1. <u>Density, quantum and standard of residential development, open space provision, public realm, Newbridge Local Area Plan 2013-2019 Policy HL6, location of crèche, potential impacts associated with the railway line</u>

# ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:

- Refusal in relation to HL6 of LAP from previous permission
- Proximity of site to town centre and railway station
- Mechanisms/introduction of apartments to achieve higher density in accordance with guidelines
- > Justification/rationale in relation to high percentage of open space provided
- > Possible noise impacts from railway to be addressed in application
- Location and accessibility of crèche including historical reason for proposed location

# **Prospective Applicant's response:**

- > Density reflects previous decision and reasons for refusal
- Phase 1 does not include any open space so will rely on open space provided in this phase (phase 1 not owned by prospective applicant), setback from railway line was also required
- Development in effect is completion of an unfinished housing estate (and includes current completion of elements including Open Space in applicant's ownership)
- Apartments in order to raise density, details will be brought up to date with new guidelines
- > Infrastructural issues in phase 1 rectified by prospective applicant
- > Justification given on local and national policy in relation to density
- > No provision regarding connection between proposed development and railway station due to involvement of 3<sup>rd</sup> party land
- > Crèche location will serve entire development

# Planning Authority's comments:

- > LAP policy restricts apartment development, no issue with density proposed
- PA accepts site can deliver higher density and that having regard to section 28 guidelines that is not unreasonable subject to quality of design
- > Higher quality and finish for apartments if included in application

# 2. Roads layout, connection to Station Road, DEMURS, traffic impacts

# ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:

- > Roads objectives on site, connection to Station Road
- > Hierarchy on layout and rationale of roads including DMURS and finishes
- > Upgrade of road and connectivity to proposed development
- > Crèche parking and issues raised in PA Opinion
- Widths of road and on-street parking

# **Prospective Applicant's response:**

Distributor road provided for through site, long term objective of gaining connection to Station Road

- > Distributor road fixed in position to facilitate underground services and associated wayleave along length of this road
- Road hierarchy design to include DMURS
- Traffic Impact Assessment to address traffic through Phase 1 and also traffic if distributor road is completed
- Agreement in principle to connect to Station Road, but outside control of applicant
- > Car parking levels an issue for density (especially for apartments, if proposed

# Planning Authority's comments:

- Objective in Development Plan to provide link from site to Station Road, and PA actively engaging with 3<sup>rd</sup> party
- Roundabout upgrade in Phase 1 carried out by developer of proposed development, parking issues on roads leading to roundabout
- > Provision of parking, drop off and cycle parking at crèche
- > 10% visitor parking should be included in proposed development
- > Address issues raised in PA Opinion

# 3. <u>Foul and surface water drainage and flood risk assessment, in particular connection to the Upper Liffey Valley Regional Sewerage Scheme</u>

# ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:

- Surface drainage from Phase 1
- > Flood area identified by PA
- > Areas applicant has control of
- > Discrepancies in mapping and Environmental Report in Flood Risk Assessment

# **Prospective Applicant's response:**

- > Surface water from Phase 1 drains through site
- > No control devices provided in Phase 1, attenuation provided for under central open space, proposals would be SUDS compliant
- Phase 1 taken in charge by PA
- > Discussions have been ongoing with Irish Water in relation to capital works

#### Planning Authority's comments:

- > Applicant to show how both phases will work together
- > PA to provide clarity as to whether Phase 1 is taken in charge
- Networks to be assessed and upgrades identified
- > Address issues raised in PA Opinion

# 4. Potential impacts on Morristownbiller House

# ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:

> Possible impacts

# **Prospective Applicant's response:**

- > Trees to be kept along boundary of adjoining site
- > Perimeter and southern part of site only effected

Landscape drawings detail tree planning and fencing

# Planning Authority's comments:

Assess visual impacts from development to be limited to impacts on the shared boundary with Morristownbillar House

#### 8. Potential impacts on Pollardstown Fen SAC

# ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:

Possible impacts on Pollardstown Fen SAC

#### Planning Authority's comments:

- > Hydrogeology to be assessed, detailed information if basements are proposed
- > Assess tree protection
- > Buffer area to be left in its natural state closer to boundary
- > Species survey to be submitted

# 9. Clarification of Part V proposals

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

Proposals to be discussed and agreed on prior to application

# **Prospective Applicant's response:**

> Error in drawings/figures submitted

#### Planning Authority's comments:

Satisfied with proposals and distribution of Part V proposed

#### Conclusions

# 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 <u>cdsdesignqa@water.ie</u> 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 <u>spatialplanning@water.ie</u>

Rachel Kenny

Director of Planning

February, 2018

ABP-300414-17 An Bord Pleanála Page 5 of 5

