

Record of Meeting ABP-306260-19

Case Reference / Description	120 no. houses with a crèche and all associated site works. Bloomfield Park, Bracklin Road, Edgeworthstown, Longford.		
Case Type	Section 5 Pre-Application Consultation Request		
1 st /2 nd /3 rd Meeting	1 st Meeting		
Date:	17 th February 2020	Start Time	11:30 a.m.
Location	Offices of An Bord Pleanála	End Time	13:00 p.m.
Chairperson	Tom Rabbette	Executive Officer	Ciaran Hand

Representing An Bord Pleanála:

Tom Rabbette, Assistant Director of Planning
Erika Casey, Senior Planning Inspector
Ciaran Hand, Executive Officer

Representing Prospective Applicant:

Ian McGrandles, Planning Consultant		
Mark Cunningham, Design, Planning, Engineering Consultant		
Joe McConville, Environmental & Landscape Consultant		
Adam Price, ORS Engineering Consultant		
John McCarthy, Applicant		
Tim McCarthy, Associate of Applicant		
Joe McCarthy, Associate of Applicant		
Brendan McVeigh, Engineer		
Michael McConville, Planner		

Representing Planning Authority

John Branigan, Director of Services, Housing & Planning
Donall Mac An Bheatha, Senior Planner
Rita Connaughton, Executive Planner

ABP-306260-19 An Bord Pleanála Page 1 of 6

Richard Smith, Executive Architect

Con Diffley, Senior Executive Engineer

Shelia Healy, Administrative Officer

Barry Lennon, Senior Executive Engineer

Bernard O' Shea, Senior Engineer

John Kelly, Senior Executive Technician

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 27th January 2020 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 20th December 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 provisions of the core strategy having regard to the RSES and the principle of sequential development.
- 2. Development Strategy: with particular regard to overall site layout, urban design and architectural approach; distribution and layout of open space; road hierarchy and compliance with DMURS; connections and permeability; house design and typology; design of neighbourhood centre; phasing of development; access strategy including measures to address wider pedestrian, cyclist and public transport connectivity.
- 3. Drainage
- 4. Crèche and Social Infrastructure
- 5. Any Other Matters
 - 1. Principle of Development: compliance with the provisions of the core strategy having regard to the RSES and the principle of sequential development.

ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:

- Core strategy.
- > RSES population targets.
- > Sequential planning and status of other undeveloped zoned land closer to the town centre.

Planning Authority's comments:

- Edgeworthstown is on the 2nd tier of the core strategy.
- Longford town is the primary target area for future growth.
- > Edgeworthstown contains schools, services, transport and employment.
- A new core strategy is being developed. Does not envisage that it will change significantly from current strategy.
- ➤ There is zoned land closer to the town centre. However, no applications have been made on these lands.
- ➤ No objection in principle to the quantum of development proposed. Consider location generally appropriate.

Prospective Applicant's response:

- There are two previous refusals and an extant permission on this site.
- ➤ There are lands designated as strategic reserve. However, site is only one of two land parcels zoned for residential development.
- ➤ A rationale will be submitted outlining why this land is appropriate for development.

Further ABP comments:

- > Other lands zoned are located closer to the town centre.
- Explain constraints and explain why this land is appropriate for development.
- Outline the suitability of Edgeworthstown as a settlement for future residential development.

 Development Strategy: with particular regard to overall site layout, urban design and architectural approach; distribution and layout of open space; road hierarchy and compliance with DMURS; connections and permeability; house design and typology; design of neighbourhood centre; phasing of development; access strategy including measures to address wider pedestrian, cyclist and public transport connectivity.

ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:

- Core urban design concept.
- Proposed layout.
- Compliance with DMURS.

Planning Authority's comments:

- Units need to front onto roads to create better passive surveillance.
- Consider treatment of entrance from Bracklin Park further.
- ➤ The open elevations of units 1-16 are a concern.
- ➤ The green spaces are generally well observed, although there are some dead spaces. Eliminate dead space and detail landscaping.
- > Outline the design of the community building.
- In relation to phasing- show how phase 1 will work.
- > Drawings should clearly delineate different phases of development.
- Finishes should reflect the design. Further consideration is required.
- The proposed raised crossings are a concern. Compliance with DMURS needs further consideration.
- > Greater set back from the Bracklin Road should be considered.
- ➤ Ensure access to the adjoining estates (both pedestrian and cycle) is provided.
- Cycleways are positive and should be provided on main routes through the development.
- Submit a permeability assessment and construction management plan.

Prospective Applicant's response:

- Construction access will be at the Bracklin Park link road. Consideration will be given to an alternative location.
- ➤ An access point will also be created at the crèche to enable better pedestrian accessibility.
- > The crèche is separate to the community hall.
- Cycle paths provided throughout the development.
- Clearer phasing drawings will be submitted.
- All connections and permeability will be shown.

Further ABP comments:

- Outline the architectural approach.
- Comply with the design guidelines.
- > Ensure the open space is functional and has appropriate passive surveillance.
- > Examine design of housing units to ensure appropriate frontage to streetscape.
- > Address the treatment at the entrance from Bracklin Park.
- Outline connectivity to existing estates.

- Explain how the neighbourhood centre functions and how community hall will be managed.
- Consider safety implications of secondary access at crèche when no public footpaths are provided.
- Address dominance of parking.
- > Try to maintain stonewalls and hedgerows.
- On phasing plan, each phase must be clearly deliverable in its own right.
- Address DMURS.
- ➤ Letter of consent would be required for any works to road junction with the Bracklin Road outside the ownership of the applicant.

3. Drainage

ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:

- > The proposed capital investment programme for new WWTP.
- > Timescale of upgrade works to WWTP.
- Other works to network that may be required.
- Drainage strategy and SUD's

Planning Authority's comments:

- Upgrade to wastewater treatment plant will be done under the IW capital investment programme. Consultants have been appointed.
- Timescale for completion is unclear as upgrades are also likely to be needed for the network.
- Check the stormwater drainage outfall capacity.
- > Examine permeable paving and other appropriate SuDS measures.
- > Technical issues raised in the Drainage Report should be addressed.

Prospective Applicant's response:

- > Agree with the P.A regarding drainage.
- Wastewater consultants are at engagement stage in relation to the capital investment programme.
- > IW have agreed a temporary treatment plan pending the upgrade works.

Further ABP comments:

- There should be no ambiguities.
- > There may be concern about the use of a temporary treatment plant where there is no certainty as to the timescale of the WWTP upgrade works.
- Further clarity will be required at application stage and applicant must demonstrate that the development is not premature.
- Look to incorporate swails into landscape strategy and other SUD's measures.

4. Crèche and Social Infrastructure

ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:

- Pedestrian access to the crèche.
- Function and management of community hall.

Planning Authority's comments:

- A crèche is not in demand.
- > Development should be future proofed to provide for a secondary pedestrian access should a footpath be delivered.
- Concern regarding viability of retail unit.

Prospective Applicant's response:

- A crèche demand analysis will be provided.
- > Will consider necessity for retail unit and community hall further.

Further ABP comments:

- > Futureproof access to the crèche.
- Outline crèche viability and show demand analysis
- Explain the function of the community hall and whether retail unit is viable and appropriate at this location.

5. A.O.B.

ABP comments:

Queried whether a bat survey was undertaken.

Planning Authority's comments:

No further comments.

Applicants Comments:

> There are no bat roosts or protected species on site

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 spatialplanning@water.ie..

Tom Rabbette	
Assistant Director of Planni	ng

March 2020