

# **Record of Meeting**

## ABP-303439-19

Description	662 no. residential dwellings (509 no. houses and 153 no. apartments), neighbourhood centre, creche and associated site works.			
	Rathmullen Road, Rathmullen, Drogheda, Co. Meath.			
Case Type	Section 5 Pre-Application Consultation Request			
Date:	20 <sup>th</sup> February 2019	Start Time	11:30 a.m.	
Location	Offices of An Bord Pleanála	End Time	13.25 p.m.	
Chairperson	Tom Rabbette	E.O.	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 Hughes, Hughes Planning and Development Consultants;		
Margaret Commane, Hughes Planning and Development Consultants;		
Jude O'Loughlin, NDBA Architects;		
Joe Gibbons, Waterman Moylan Engineers;		
Eoin Halpin, Project Archaeological Consultant (AHC Ltd.);		
David Fitzpatrick, applicant representative; and		
David O'Reilly, applicant representative.		
Aidan Corless- Applicant		
Declan O' Leary – Cunnane Stratton Reynolds		

## **Representing Planning Authority**

Sean Clarke , SEO	
Padraig Maguire , SEP	

Joe Mc Garvey, SEE	
David O' Reilly , EE	

#### 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 8<sup>th</sup> February 2019 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 11<sup>th</sup> January 2019 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. Meath County Development Plan zoning objectives, phasing.
- 2. Roads and traffic impacts
- 3. Residential design and layout, landscape and visual impacts
- 4. Site Services and Flood Risk
- 5. Archaeology
- 6. Any other matters.

#### 1. Meath County Development Plan zoning objectives, phasing.

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

- > The strategic objectives of this site
- > Status of the current development plan and the proposed new development plan
- If the proposed development is a material contravention
- Phasing stages

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

- ➤ The county plan expires in 2019
- RSES should be agreed in April, at draft development stage in the summer and on display in September
- > The aim would be to retain zoning
- Phasing has been examined in the new plan
- In this plan Drogheda has been prioritised
- Material contravention is contained in our submitted report regarding this development
- ➤ It's for the board to decide if there is material contravention
- > The prospective applicant has taken a reasonable approach to phasing

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

- Drogheda is a growth area and the objective is to build houses and apartments to help ease the housing crisis
- > A justification will be submitted
- > This site has been prioritised and has received a second-tier score

#### **Further ABP comments:**

- Outline the strategic objectives of this site and the overall area
- Decide if there is a material contravention and if yes submit a statement
- Notify Louth County Council if an application is being lodged

#### 2. Road and Traffic Impacts

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

- Junctions impacted by the proposed development
- Upgrades to the Rathmullen road
- Rationale for the proposed roundabout

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

- Junction 2 has been upgraded
- Junction 3 has been assessed and does require upgrading
- > Traffic counts on the four junctions show very little comparison to 2006
- Propose to carry out upgrades on junctions
- Discussions have taken place with Louth County Council
- Junction 3 has overcapacity therefore signals, controls and markings will all be upgraded in the public realm
- No 3<sup>rd</sup> party consents are required

- The roundabout is being proposed but a controlled and signalised junction would be preferred
- ➤ All works will be contained inside the red line boundary
- Work needs to be done regarding level differences with the opposite road to deliver pedestrian and cycle way with shared lines
- There will be connections to Riverside walk

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

- Four key junctions are affected
- Junction called "Site 1" is directly affected
- > Two junctions are located in Louth
- Satisfied with the assessment impact
- > Open to a proposed controlled and signalised junction instead of a roundabout
- > Ensure that there is a pedestrian and cycle way with shared lines
- There needs to be permeability around the site
- Some paths may cross into Louth
- Clarify with Louth County Council
- Upgrades may require a contribution

#### **Further ABP comments:**

- Talk to Louth regarding the upgrading of junctions and any other issues
- Outline what works are required, who is delivering them and how it's being delivered
- > Submit cross sections showing how the pedestrian and cycle ways fit into the landscape proposals
- Talk with Meath and Louth County Councils to see if they are seeking contributions for upgrades
- ➤ If there are disagreements provide a rationale
- ➤ There is no further information sought at application stage

#### 3. Residential design and layout, landscape and visual impacts

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

- > Rational for the layout, location of apartments and the creche
- > Visual impacts on the wider area

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

- > This is a bookend site
- > The motorway forms the boundary to the site
- ➤ The layout is to cater for neighbourhoods
- Brick screen walls have been used
- Corner apartments will have own door access
- Conscious of the proximity of the Mary McAleese bridge
- This feature has been addressed through providing a modest scale and taller apartments
- ➤ Balconies are set in to help with noise
- Accessibility to childcare and retail is not at the edge of the site
- > Tree protections and removals will be set out

- > The site is not visible from Newgrange
- ➤ There is visibility from north of the Boyne looking back
- > Urban edges and woodland edges will be shown
- Views from the Mary McAleese bridge and Newgrange will be sought

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

- This is a constrained site
- It has a soft edge containing green areas
- Accesses are pre-determined
- > There is a hierarchy of streets
- Section 711 of the Cultural Heritage report shows that there are no key views from Bruna Bona or Newgrange
- > In principal happy with the layout

#### **Further ABP comments:**

- Detail the corners, boundary treatments and approach into the site
- Show the wider visual impact
- Look at the location of where high density is being proposed and provide a rationale
- > Examine the impact of noise as a result of the motorway
- Address drop off points at the creche and how its integrated
- Provide a calculation of creche trips
- Detail tree protections and removal
- > A visual impact assessment is very important

#### 4. Site Services and Flood Risk

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

- > The flood zone on the site
- > The proposed pumping station
- > Water connections
- Surface water drainage

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

- Address the sizing of the culvert
- > Examine the surface water with regards to the discharge rate
- > Flood issues can be resolved however the ditch cannot carry a further load
- > The location of the pumping station will mean articulated tankers on the roads
- > Examine how this will be managed

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

- There is a proposal for a foul water pumping station
- Discussions have taken place with Irish water
- ➤ The aim is for a strategic pumping station
- > Irish water is satisfied with the proposed station
- There is an underground storage tank which needs to increase
- No planning permission is required for this increase

- ➤ Irish water requires a distance of 15 metres, the pumping station is beyond this distance
- ➤ A foul water connection is being provided within the red line boundary
- ➤ Attenuation is being provided for surface water drainage
- Water will flow through a number of catchments
- > The volume of storage has been tested
- ➤ There is a facility to filter
- > An open ditch will be culverted
- Surface water will be discharged into the culvert (1200 in diameter)
- ➤ There are level distances from 34m to 3m
- A flood route is designed throughout the site
- > The upstream flow can facilitate the motorway
- > The ditch has high capacity

#### **Further ABP comments:**

- Address noise, odour and distance
- Detail the proposed foul water connection
- > Examine if there are impacts on the Louth boundary
- Submit a site-specific flood risk assessment

#### 5. Archaeology

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

Archaeological testing

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

- Extensive testing has occurred in the past
- We have a license for testing
- > The phase of testing will be outlined
- > There is a new testing strategy
- > Focus is not only on archaeological testing but also the cultural e.g. metal testing, battlefield work

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

Aware that more testing needs to be done

#### **Further ABP comments:**

Provide a detailed assessment of archaeology

#### 6. Any other matters

### Planning Authority's comments:

No further comments

#### **Applicants Comments:**

> No further comments

#### **ABP** comments:

- Examine EIAR regulations
- ➤ There are adjacent sites- check Appropriate Assessment
- Clarify hydraulic connections- downstream impacts

#### **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
- Proposed development must be specifically described in public notices as build to rent housing for long-term rental housing
- 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 <a href="mailto:spatialplanning@water.ie">spatialplanning@water.ie</a>

**Tom Rabbette, Assistant Director of Planning** 

March 2019

ABP-303439-18 An Bord Pleanála Page 7 of 7