

Record of Meeting ABP-302484-18

Case Reference / Description	111 no. residential units (103 no. houses, 8 no. apartments) and all associated site works. Newtown, Kill, Co. Kildare.		
Case Type	Section 5 Pre-Application Consultation Request		
1 st /2 nd /3 rd Meeting	1st Meeting		
Date:	11 th October, 2018	Start Time	15:00 p.m.
Location	Offices of An Bord Pleanála	End Time	16:50 p.m.
Chairperson	Tom Rabbette	Executive Officer	Ciaran Hand

Representing An Bord Pleanála:

Tom Rabbette, Assistant Director of Planning	
Sarah Moran, Senior Planning Inspector	
Ciaran Hand, Executive Officer	

Representing Prospective Applicant:

Kevin Traynor, Director, Resource Five Ltd.
Brigid Ryan, Planner, Resource Five Ltd.
Kevin Laffey, Architect, CCK Architects
Claire Burke, Architect, CCK Architects
Declan Brassil, Planner, DBCL
Gary Lindsay, Engineer, Cronin Sutton Consulting Engineers
Dan Egan, Landscape Architect, The Big Space

Representing Planning Authority

Patricia Conlon, Senior Executive Planner	
Fiona Breen, Executive Planner	
George Willoughby, Senior Engineer, Transportation	
Darren Hughes, Senior Executive Engineer, Water	
Mary McCarthy, Administrative Officer, Housing	

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 28th September 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 4th September 2018 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. Development Strategy for the site including density, layout and unit mix.
- 2. Drainage Foul & Surface Water
- 3. Roads layout, traffic and transport issues
- 4. Social infrastructure
- 5. Part V
- 6. Any other matters

1. Development Strategy for the site including density, layout and unit mix

ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:

- > Rationale for the net density of the site
- > Is the buffer excluded from net calculation density
- Density in relation to the national policy
- Is proposed development compliant with DMURS?
- ➤ Requirement for a hierarchy of open spaces, also spaces to serve specific purposes.
- Boundary treatment wall
- > Quantum of open space
- ➤ High proportion of 3 bed units in the proposed housing mix
- ➤ Lack of permeability, connections to adjoining lands
- Location of Part V units
- Development to address adjoining lands zoned for public open space

Prospective Applicant's response:

- > Buffer is excluded from net calculation density
- Question of density can be examined
- It is compliant with DMURS
- > Can look at increasing visitor car parking
- > There are pocket park spaces, play facilities provided
- All spaces are overlooked to give a softer edge
- Alley ways required for bin storage and will be gated
- No public lightning this will be examined
- > Eastern boundary wall will be fencing
- > A 2-metre-high wall will be only for GAA lands who asked for it
- Quantum space is 15 percent depending on the layout

Planning Authority's comments:

- ➤ Location of proposed development is an edge of small town, should be a density of 15-20 per hectare in accordance with national guidelines
- More visitor car parking is required
- Lands adjoining are zoned open spaces
- > Fear alleyways can cause anti-social behaviour
- > Is there public lightening?
- > Difficulty with 1 bed apartments for the market

Further ABP comments:

- Calculation of net density justify in accordance with section 28 guidelines as well as local statutory policy
- Justify provision of a buffer
- Justify the amount of open space and purpose that they serve, rationale and hierarchy of open spaces
- ➤ Bin storage could be designed to remove the need for alleyways
- Need to show how alleyways will be managed and maintained
- Provide visuals of the boundary wall
- Justify housing mix in context of the provision in the area

2. Drainage- Foul & Surface Water

ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:

- CPO process has commenced on the Upper Liffey Valley project
- ➤ Issue of prematurity in advance of the outcome of the CPO process
- Proposed phasing / interim arrangement in advance of Contract 2B.
- ➤ How to treat pumping off peak

Prospective Applicant's response:

- > Agreed interim arrangement from Irish Water to install a pumping station
- > To provide 24-48-hour storage on site
- > Not proposing permanent storage
- ➤ Proposed rising main is to be permanent and in use when Contract 2B is complete.
- > Capacity can be increased
- Pumping will be off peak
- > Further engagement will take place with Irish water and the P.A.

Planning Authority's comments:

- ➤ No issue with rising mains
- Concerned about the issue of pumping
- > Off peak pumping is possible
- Capital project may not be delivered
- Will storage stay in this case?
- Advise that tank can be enlarged for all proposed units- capacity to serve all as an emergency measure
- Proposal to discharge- Engineering report required

Further ABP comments:

- > Establish pumping capacity is available
- Engineering report is required
- > Application could be premature in advance of CPO outcome

3. Roads Layout, traffic and transport issues

ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:

- Why is a roundabout included?
- > Justification for the distributor road and when the road will be built
- > Permeability and connections to adjoining lands
- ➤ Use of cul-de-sacs not compliant with DMURS, also 'parallel' roads alongside the distributor road.
- Housing layout could address the distributor road.
- Likelihood of the distributor road being constructed in the lifetime of the current plan.

Prospective Applicant's response:

- ➤ A setback of 18.5m from distributor road is required (in accordance with Development Management Standards of the CDP)
- Permeability can be examined

Planning Authority's comments:

- Roundabout is included for access on the future use
- > Agree with setback measurement
- ➤ Envisage distributor road will take heavy vehicles from other areas
- Construction of the road is not high on the list of priorities
- Concern about the issue of permeability on the road

Further ABP comments:

- Is the road a specific objective and will it be delivered in the lifetime of a granting of permission of the application
- > Examine possible connections to adjoining sites.
- ➤ Rationale for proposed roads layout, particularly the 18.5m setback in an urban area

4. Social Infrastructure

ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:

- Existing childcare provision in the area
- Is a creche proposed?

Prospective Applicant's response:

- ➤ There has been a high-level assessment showing that there are five creches in the area with one hundred and forty existing spaces
- ➤ The high-level assessment will be submitted at application stage

Planning Authority's comments:

- ➤ There should be a creche in accordance with guidelines
- Give rationale why a creche is not required
- ➤ Limited social provision one primary school and no secondary school in the area

Further ABP comments:

- A rationale as to why a creche is not required
- > Detail on how facilities in the area and capacity will meet the 2001 guidelines
- > If not meeting deadlines- a rationale is required

5. Any other matters

ABP comments:

- Clarify how Part V proposals are integrated into the proposed development
- Informed the prospective applicant regarding EIAR screening and procedures

Prospective Applicant's comments:

Has provided new Part V proposals to the P.A.

Planning Authority's comments:

- Applicant has revisited the Part V
- 1 beds have been provided in the Part V
- Prefer apartments near the entrance- in line with the disability strategy
- Desire to have ground floor apartments

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 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

Tom Rabbette
Director of Planning
31st October 2018

ABP-302484-18 An Bord Pleanála Page 6 of 6