



An
Bord
Pleanála

Record of Meeting ABP-304494-19

Case Reference / Description	487 no. dwellings (317 no. houses and 58 no. apartments and 12 no. duplex apartments), creche and associated works. Limekilnhill (Townland), Belmont, Academy Street, Navan, Co. Meath.		
Case Type	Section 5 Pre-Application Consultation Request		
Date:	21 st June 2019	Start Time	14:40 p.m.
Location	Offices of An Bord Pleanála	End Time	16:15 p.m.
Chairperson	Tom Rabbette	Executive Officer	Ciaran Hand

Representing An Bord Pleanála:

Tom Rabbette, Assistant Director of Planning
Karen Kenny, Senior Planning Inspector
Ciaran Hand, Executive Officer

Representing Prospective Applicant:

Simon Walsh, Coindale Limited
Hugh Lynn, Coindale Limited
Michael Crowe, CCK Architects
Paul McVeigh, CCK Architects
Declan O'Leary, CSR Landscape Architects
Ronan Kearns, Pinnacle Consulting Engineers
Niall Barrett, CS Consulting
Robert Fitzmaurice, CS Consulting
John Spain, John Spain Associates
Rory Kunz, John Spain Associates
John Cornin, Archaeology

Representing Planning Authority

Joe McGarvey, Senior Executive Engineer
David Keyes, Senior Executive Engineer
Billy Joe Padden, Executive Planner
Padraig Maguire, Senior Executive Planner

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 13th June 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 17th May 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. **Principle of Development: compliance with the phasing requirements of the Navan Town Development Plan.**
2. **Infrastructural Constraints – wastewater and water supply network.**
3. **Development Strategy – density, site layout and urban design approach, housing mix and topologies, finishes and materials, access and road hierarchy, gradient, car parking and bicycle parking.**
4. **Architectural Heritage and Archaeology.**
5. **Traffic.**
6. **Any Other Business.**

1. **Principle of Development: compliance with the phasing requirements of the Navan Town Development Plan.**

ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:

- Proposal to develop lands identified as Phase II (Post 2019) Residential in the Navan Development Plan.

Planning Authority's comments:

- Lands are suitable for residential development in the emerging Meath County Development Plan 2020-2026.
- Correction to PA's Opinion. Table 1 states that the total capacity of Phase 1 residential lands is 4778 units. This should read 3466 units.

Prospective Applicant's response:

- The phasing will be addressed at application stage.

Further ABP comments:

- If making an application that contravenes the phasing provisions of the extant Navan Development Plan (Objective CS OBJ 3), a justification for release of the Phase II (Post 2019) lands should be made. The justification should include an examination of the current status of lands identified within the Phase I order of priority.

2. **Infrastructural Constraints – wastewater and water supply network**

ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:

- Wastewater and water supply constraints.
- Any CPO / 3rd party consents and statutory consents that may be required.

Planning Authority's comments:

- Irish Water issues are straightforward and feasible.
- No CPO or 3rd party consents required.

Prospective Applicant's response:

- Irish Water prepared a masterplan for Navan that identifies a number of significant network upgrades.
- The applicant undertook an independent assessment of capacity and engaged with Irish Water. Irish Water have confirmed that connections can be facilitated

subject to the upgrade of an existing watermain and the provision of a new gravity sewer. No CPOs / 3rd party consents or statutory consents will be required

Further ABP comments:

- The applicant may wish to provide further clarification in relation to upgrades at application stage.

3. Development Strategy – density, housing mix and topologies, site layout and urban design approach, finishes and materials, access and road hierarchy, gradient, car parking and bicycle parking.

ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:

- Overall density given the sites position relative to Navan town centre.
- The calculation of net density having regard to the guidance set out in Appendix A of the Sustainable Residential Development Guidelines.
- The housing mix and the overall number of two storey 3 and 4 bed units.
- The proposed layout and urban design approach having regard to the 12 Best Practice Criteria in the Design Manual and concerns regarding the creation of character areas and a sense of place, a hierarchy of streets and the general suburban nature of the layout.

Planning Authority's comments:

- Net density is 40 units per hectare.
- There are constraints relating to a protected structure, gradient and existing housing.
- Density is appropriate.
- The application should be viewed in the context of the town as a whole. Housing mix is appropriate in this context.
- Compliance with DMURS is important.
- Finishes are of a good quality.

Prospective Applicant's response:

- In relation to net site area the Guidelines states that net site area excludes roads and open spaces serving a wider area. The access road would serve a school. The open space would have a wider neighbourhood function and protected trees leave the lands undevelopable.
- The unit mix is 40% 1-2 beds.
- The design is guided by site characteristics including the protected structure, gradient and vegetation. Submitted documentation includes a Landscape Masterplan and Design Report and an Architectural Design Statement.
- The proposed development along Academy Street has a harder edge due to its urban context.
- To the rear there are four distinct character areas formed around a series of connected open spaces and a hierarchy of routes.

Further ABP comments:

- The applicant is advised to provide further clarity/justification in relation to the net site area and areas excluded, particularly where the areas contribute towards meeting Development Plan standards.
- The applicant may wish to reconsider and/or provide justification or clarification at application stage in relation to the overall layout and urban design approach in the context of the 12 Best Practice Criteria detailed in the Sustainable Residential Development Guidelines, the Urban Development and Building Heights Guidelines and the Design Manual for Urban Roads and Streets, particularly in relation to the creation of a sense of place, hierarchy, building height and unit mix.
- Further detail may be provided in relation to level differences, the extent of cut and fill, and retaining walls.
- Further detail may be provided in relation to pedestrian and cycle connections within the site and to services and facilities in the wider area.
- The further consideration of these issues may require an amendment to the design proposals submitted in order to demonstrate compliance with national guidance.

4. Architectural Heritage and Archaeology**ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:**

- Impact on Belmont House the Protected Structure.
- Impact on archaeology sites and materials found within the site.

Planning Authority's comments:

- In relation to impact on Architectural Heritage, refer to the opinion of the Conservation Officer contained in the PA's Opinion.

Prospective Applicant's response:

- An assessment of impact on Belmont House can be submitted.
- Two archaeological closures were found to the rear of Belmont House dating from medieval times. It would be the applicant's intention to record and preserve the discoveries. The applicant awaits a response from DCHG.

Further ABP comments:

- The applicant is advised to consider submitting a Built Heritage Impact Assessment to address the potential for impacts on Belmont House and associated curtilage and landscapes.
- The applicant is advised to consider submitting an Archaeological Impact Assessment and to liaise with the DCHG in relation to mitigation measures.
- The applicant is advised that all matters would need to be fully addressed within the application.

5. Traffic

ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:

- Traffic Impact Assessment.
- Car Parking numbers for apartments

Planning Authority's comments:

- Both access points are a concern.
- Concerns raised in relation to assumptions contained in the TIA in relation to trip generation and impacts on the adjacent priority-controlled junctions. Applicant has struggled to validate junction model. Observations show that right turns are clogging up the traffic onto Dublin Road and Circular Road. Academy street is a key street within Navan and provides a link to the town centre.
- The R147/Academy Street junction needs to be signalised for capacity and safety reasons. The applicant should carry out the upgrades.
- On the internal access road, a gradient of 8% is acceptable over short distances.
- There is a concern regarding the proximity of the road to a retaining wall which is near apartments. Pedestrian and cycle access is also a concern.

Prospective Applicant's response:

- National guidance is being followed in regard to parking numbers.
- Question the need to signalise junction of R147 and Dublin Road. Traffic surveys show junctions operating within capacity.
- TIA allows for some school trips even though the school is not in the site.
- Local junctions can accommodate the site.
- There are opportunities to connect to the school.
- All accesses are within gradient except at the woodland area where trees are to be retained.
- Detail for pedestrian and cycle access will be provided.

Further ABP comments:

- If making an application that contravenes the Development Plan car parking standards, further justification may be needed by reference to national guidance.
- The applicant may want to provide further consideration/justification in the TIA in relation to trip generation and the capacity of the local road network in response to the items raised in Section 7.4 of the Planning Authority Opinion.
- The applicant may wish to provide more detail in relation to the accessibility of the site for cyclists and pedestrians and on possible future connections to services and facilities in the wider area.

6. Any other matters

ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:

- Flood Risk Assessment and impact on access points in a flood event.
- The prospective applicant is reminded of the need for clarity and appropriate use of language in all matters concerning Appropriate Assessment.
- Recommend the use of SUD's drainage features. If this is not being proposed by the applicant there needs to be justification.

Planning Authority's comments:

- The flood zones encroach onto the site and all proposed access points. Development Management Justification Test needed.
- Access point at the town centre is in the 600-700 mm flood depth and 300 mm at the proposed junction. The cut-off point for development/access is 250mm.
- Flood extents and flood depths need to be addressed in the FRA.

Applicants Comments:

- Flood Risk Assessment can include detail of flood extents and flood depths, and a Justification Test.
- Roads may need to be elevated and this will help with flood depths.
- Attenuation tanks will be needed within landscape areas for storm water storage. Site not suitable for large SuDS features.

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 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
Assistant Direct of Planning
June, 2019