



An
Bord
Pleanála

Record of Meeting ABP-305570-19

Description	132 no. residential units (116 no. houses, 16 no. apartments) and associated site works. Ballinahinch, Ashford, Co. Wicklow.		
Case Type	Section 5 Pre-Application Consultation Request		
Date:	15 th November, 2019	Start Time	2:15pm
Location	Offices of An Bord Pleanála	End Time	3:45pm
Chairperson	Tom Rabbette, Assistant Director of Planning	E.O.	Hannah Cullen

Representing An Bord Pleanála:

Tom Rabbette, Assistant Director of Planning
Ronan O'Connor, Planning Inspector
Hannah Cullen, Executive Officer

Representing Prospective Applicant:

John White, Ardstone
Steve Cassidy, Ardstone
Gavin Lawlor, TPA Planning Consultants
Sam Wallace, TPA Planning Consultants
Leanne Courtney, McCrossan O'Rourke Manning Architects
Stephen Manning, McCrossan O'Rourke Manning Architects
Matthew Mulvey, KFLA Landscape Architects
Felim Sheridan, Arborist Associates
Clodagh Holmes, Aecom Engineers

Representing Planning Authority

Fergal Keogh, Senior Executive Planner
Aisling McNamara, Planner
Declan O'Brien, Engineer, Roads

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 **4th November, 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 **8th October 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. Zoning**
- 2. Design/Layout/Mix** (*density, compliance with Urban Design Manual, DMURS, open space provision, mix of units*)
- 3. Transport** (*including cycle and pedestrian links, permeability, car parking provision, proposed infrastructure upgrades.*)
- 4. Site Services** (*Water supply, surface water, foul/required upgrades*)
- 5. Trees/Ecology/Appropriate Assessment**
- 6. Childcare Provision**
- 7. Any other matters**

- 1. Zoning**

ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:

- The SLO2 objective for the site and its impact on the development proposals.
- Applicant's justification for non-compliance with same.
- Reasoning behind the original zoning of the lands.

PA Comments:

- Acknowledge the lands are in separate ownership.
- Land owners should work together to provide quality community open space and facilities.
- Existing school appears close to capacity.
- Need for another school in the area wasn't previously identified, now due to housing development there may be demand.
- School isn't in the SL02 area.
- Advises consultation with the Department of Education.

Prospective Applicants response:

- Don't have control over/own the community land.
- In previous cases land for amenity space was in control of the adjoining land owner.
- Concerns regarding pressure being placed on the applicant to provide facilities for the surrounding area/town.
- Not opposed to providing community facilities.
- Possibility of discussing increased contributions to pay for community facilities in the future.
- Have met with the local school.
- An audit has been done on provision of schools in the area, no shortage of spaces identified.
- Have consulted with the Department, do not have any letters confirming this.
- Have spoken with the land owner who has no plans to develop the lands in the immediate future.

Further ABP comments:

- Social infrastructure audit to be carried out.
- Details of contributions in lieu (if that is being proposed) should be discussed with the planning authority in advance of any application and detailed at application stage.

Further Applicant comments:

- Will advertise as a material contravention at application stage

- Considering Section 48 contributions/ Can discuss with the planning authority different methods/special level contributions.

Further PA comments:

- Unsure about contribution option, will have further discussions.

2. Design/Layout/Mix

ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:

- Calculation of net site area/density. Need to clarify by way of a drawing which areas have/have not been included.
- Frequency of public transport services serving Ashford (The No. 133 Bus).
- Nature of the open spaces proposed. ABP noted that some spaces may be compromised by the provision of road linkages that may not be necessary. ABP also noted that the open space to south-east was entirely surrounded by roads/potential concern in relation to safety.
- Nature of the duplex units/entrances to same. Justify material pallet used.
- Variety of dwelling types provided/materials proposed for same.
- ABP noted that there was 13% open space proposed – slight shortfall in the 15% required. Also acknowledged sloped area which was not included in the calculation had some visual amenity value.

PA comments:

- Sought to encourage pedestrian links and permeability through the site.
- Willing to engage in conversations with the applicant regarding shared services and other technical issues.

Prospective Applicants response:

- All net site area/net density calculations will be accounted for at application stage.
- In relation to public transport, it was stated that there was one No. 133 bus per hour. A lot of the occupants of the recently constructed estate were working and living in Wicklow (about 76%)
- Seek to maintain as much of the existing hedgerow along the road as possible.
- Requirement of 15% open space by the planning authority - currently achieving 13% with this development.
- 5.5 metre road width to 6 metres at the entrance to development due to slope at roundabout.

- Open area available to the south of the site can be relooked at.
- Taken in charge map has been included in the pre-application.
- Discussion is welcomed regarding material choices and details.

Further ABP comments:

- Ensure compliance with DMURS
- Detail how the open spaces operate, and the safety measures associated.
- Review the area of open space to the north having regard to the potential removal of the future road link.
- Include CGI's and photomontages at application stage to demonstrate views of the front of development.

3. Transport

ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:

- Proposed pedestrian footpath link to the town/Justification for non-provision of a footpath to the eastern side of the R764/details of any pedestrian crossing proposed/ Include justification at application stage as to why a footpath on the eastern side cannot be provided, demonstrate the options investigated and chosen resolution.
- Details of future links to sites to the north and east/potential for same to be opened up in the future/need to provide a footpath or pedestrian link close to or adjacent to the R764 which links to the employment lands to the north.
- Impact on the Protected Structure (Dawn Cottage) as a result of the proposed pedestrian path/impact on the curtilage of same/details of the proposed boundary treatment for this Protected Structure/Architectural Heritage Impact assessment required at application stage.
- Details of boundary treatments to the other dwellings on the western side of the R764 which will be impacted by the provision of a pedestrian link.
- Queried if internal roads were DMURS compliant – some appear slightly wider than DMURS standards.

PA comments:

- Footpath is an important element for the site, one would suffice.
- At application stage report could be submitted detailing crossing point and the reasoning for same/the desire line is located east of the road.

Prospective Applicants response:

- Links to the east will be through the school/School is not open to such a link at present/link through church ground is also not an option at present/however provisions will be made for future links.
- West of the site lies an open stream, idea to culvert not an option/is a significant constraint in relation to a provision of a footpath along the eastern side of the R764/would have a significant impact on the stream.
- Discussions with the owners along the western side road/ have consent to create a footpath along the western side of the R764/
- Dawn cottage (Protected Structure) lies beside proposed footpath, idea is to move the front hedging back, with no works to the building itself.
- Noted that a boundary wall of up to 1.8m high would be provided to other dwellings.

Further PA comments:

- Soft boundary treatment was preferable to a higher wall.

Further ABP comments:

- Heritage officer's submission at application stage will be important.
- Expressed some concern in relation to the visual impact of a 1.8m wall to boundaries of dwellings along the western side of R764 - justify/possibly reconsider and provide additional details at application stage.

Further Applicant comments:

- Will liaise with Wicklow's heritage officer before application stage.

4. Site Services**ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:**

- Response from Irish Water.

PA comments:

- Nothing to add.

Prospective Applicants response:

- Previous confirmation received from Irish Water accepting 107 units, In September revised number of 150 units accepted.

- Waiting for updated confirmation of feasibility documentation.
- All drainage drawings show the updated works.
- Numerous meetings/discussions with Irish Water regarding the development.

Further ABP comments:

- Ensure all up to date documentation from Irish Water is submitted at application stage, along with any other discussion details.

5. Trees/Ecology/Appropriate Assessment

ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:

- Details of what trees are being kept.

PA comments:

- Particular tree species require protection.

Prospective Applicants response:

- Keeping all tree's bar three high amenity species.
- Revised layout will be submitted at application stage showing tree species saved.
- No dig method proposed at footpath area to reduce any impact on the trees.
- Ecologist commented no significant risk to S.A.C

Further ABP comments:

- Ensure all relevant documentation/findings are provided at application stage.

6. Childcare Provision

ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:

- Whether crèche in the previous development is constructed.

PA comments:

- Satisfied with creche provision.

Prospective Applicants response:

- Construction of creche in previous development is nearly complete, hoping to be finished before end of December.
- Creche holds 90 places

7. Any other matters

ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:

- Mix of units provided, potential to provide more 2 beds.

PA comments:

- Shortfall in smaller 1-2 bed units.
- In relation to surface water possibility of looking at culvert at the back of River Walk due to past flooding issues.

Prospective Applicants response:

- Calculations of the mix of units can be provided at application stage.
- Idea of 1 beds is challenging if apartment blocks are not being included in the development.
- There is a good mix of 2,3 and 4 bed units (50% 3 bed, 37% 4 bed, 13% 2bed)
- Duplex block can be looked at to include more 1-2 bed.
- Culvert can be looked into in relation to River Walk however there will be no increase in any run off water from the development.

Further ABP comments:

- Inclusion of details of material contravention (if applicable) on public notices

Conclusions:

The representatives of ABP emphasised the following:

- 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,
Assistant Director of Planning
December, 2019