



An
Bord
Pleanála

Record of Meeting ABP-306876-20

Case Reference / Description	Demolition of existing structures, construction of 126 no. apartments and associated site works. Harbour Industrial Estate, Bray, Co. Wicklow		
Case Type	Section 5 Pre-Application Consultation Request		
Date:	21 st May 2020	Start Time	09:35 a.m.
Location	Via Microsoft Teams	End Time	11:44 a.m.
Chairperson	Tom Rabbette	Executive Officer	Ciaran Hand

Representing An Bord Pleanála:

Tom Rabbette, Assistant Director of Planning
Lorraine Dockery, Senior Planning Inspector
Ciaran Hand, Executive Officer

Representing Prospective Applicant:

Brian O' Flanagan, Architect
Henk Van Der Kamp, Town Planner
Stephen Reid, Traffic & Transport
Ian Gaskell, Marine & Coastal Risk Management

Representing Planning Authority

Fergal Keogh, Senior Planner
Edel Bermingham, Senior Executive Planner
Brian O' Sullivan, Roads Department
Liam Bourke, Senior Executive Engineer

Introduction

The representatives of An Bord Pleanála (ABP) welcomed the prospective applicant, the Local Authority (LA) 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 P.A on 29th April 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 LA 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 13th March 2020 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. **Policy Context**
2. **Development Strategy to include suitability of ground conditions; layout; height, scale, massing; elevational treatment; materials; permeability; child-care provision; Part V**
3. **Visual Amenity**
4. **Residential Amenity**
5. **Biodiversity**
6. **Traffic and Transport**
7. **Drainage and Flooding**
8. **Any other matters**

1. Policy Context

ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:

- Table 3.1 and section 7.2 of LAP which seeks preparation of masterplan for lands in Bray Harbour

Planning Authority's comments:

- Funding is not currently in place regarding a masterplan
- Satisfied that development can be undertaken, in the absence of a masterplan once its objectives are being met
- Lands to the north of the site are owned by the Council

Prospective Applicant's response:

- Objectives of a masterplan can be addressed

Further ABP comments:

- Set out objectives of masterplan as contained in LAP and ensure consistency with same
- Have regard to any potential material contravention

2. Development Strategy to include suitability of ground conditions; layout; height, scale, massing; elevational treatment; materials; permeability; childcare provision; Part V

ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:

- Ground conditions and suitability of land for development of the nature and scale proposed, having regard to Table 3.1 of LAP; potential contamination
- Proposal needs to reflect the locational context of the site
- Desire expressed that a high quality development, which provides active ground floor uses and vibrant public realm, be delivered for this site
- Height, scale and massing of proposed development - queried whether proposal was the optimal architectural/design solution for the subject site- noted development previously permitted on golf club lands
- Materials/finishes proposed considering, inter alia, the exposed location of site
- Queried whether bicycle storage at ground floor level onto open space and promenade was the most appropriate use at this location
- Permeability through the site to beach, promenade, shops, schools and public transport
- Justification for lack of childcare provision
- Part V proposals

Planning Authority's response:

- Investigation of ground conditions required
- Height is a concern, in particular, impacts on the promenade; justification for height proposed should be included in any application
- Proposed development is isolated in relation to other developments
- A childcare rationale needs to be submitted
- In regard to Part V, pepper potting is not desired

Prospective Applicant's response:

- Any contamination is low grade; full site investigation will be undertaken
- Proposed height bookends the town; a gateway location with an identifiable building
- Promenade will be extended
- Attractive materials are being used
- Location of the bicycle storage can be examined

Further ABP comments:

- Submit ground surveys and results of technical investigation and clarify if there is any potential contamination
- Demonstrate the layout proposed provides for a quality development at this important location; submit additional details/justification in terms of height, scale and massing; elevational treatment needs further refinement and examination
- Submit drawings showing relationship with the golf club lands
- Address matters raised in terms of public realm; concerns regarding ground floor uses of bicycle storage/plant at ground floor onto open space and public realm; mitigates against creation of a vibrant public realm
- Concerns raised in relation to use of render and timber finishes at this exposed location
- Location of car parking and loading bays needs to be examined in terms of providing quality public realm
- Permeability through the site needs further consideration
- Landscaping- ensure it's appropriate given locational context
- Justification for lack of childcare facility

3. Visual Amenity

ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:

- Concerns raised by PA in terms of possible visual impacts on Martello Terrace/Bath House and possible visual impacts on promenade

Planning Authority's response:

- Visuals and CGI's would be beneficial

Prospective Applicant's response:

- CGI's and visuals showing any potential impacts on the promenade and other amenities will be submitted

Further ABP comments:

- CGI's/visualisations/cross sections will be important from near and longer-range viewpoints to demonstrate possible impacts, if any, on the landscape at this location

4. Residential Amenity

ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:

- Compliance with Sustainable Urban Housing: Design Standards for New Apartments Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2018); internal amenity standards; daylight/sunlight analysis; schedule of floor areas; storage areas; private open space
- Clearly outline aspect of all units on a drawing at application stage

Planning Authority's response:

- Amenities for future occupants needs to be detailed

Prospective Applicant's response:

- All such information will be submitted at application stage

5. Biodiversity

ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:

- Potential impacts on biodiversity given locational context of the site
- Address AA at application stage

Planning Authority's response:

- Potential impacts on biodiversity need to be outlined

Prospective Applicant's response:

- Biodiversity matters will be addressed at application stage

Further ABP comments:

- Submit an environmental construction and demolition plan at application stage

6. Traffic and Transport

ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:

- Justification for extent of parking proposed
- Access to proposed development in terms of capacity/appropriateness of harbour bridge
- Pedestrian and cycle access
- Other matters raised in section 3.9 of PA Opinion

Planning Authority's response:

- Currently satisfied with capacity of harbour bridge to accommodate existing movements
- Movements will increase on foot of proposed development, upgrade needed, however PA have no plans to deliver upgrade; concerns raised
- There should be a separate bridge for pedestrians
- Access under the rail line is controlled by Irish Rail
- Junction with Seapoint Road may also be an issue
- Concern with scale of traffic generated from significant parking proposed

Prospective Applicant's response:

- Cycle and pedestrian connections are along the harbour bridge
- Aware of the importance of a permeability link
- Cycleway and footpaths should be provided by the local council

Further ABP comments:

- 240 car parking spaces are being proposed; appears excessive given locational context of site beside good public transport and town centre
- Submit a car parking rationale
- Show connections to wider area on a map
- Address matters raised by PA in their Opinion; liaise with PA prior to lodging application; no provision for Further Information in SHD process

7. Drainage and Flooding**ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:**

- Matters raised in section 3.10 of PA Opinion and IW report to ABP
- Flood risk assessment
- Wave overtopping

Planning Authority's response:

- Examine possibility of temporary on-site drainage storage; may be required for a short-term event
- River Dargle does not appear to be a direct risk; flood defence completed
- This is a vulnerable site with flooding in the past
- Examine what defences are required; mitigation measures may be needed

Prospective Applicant's response:

- Sea levels have been examined
- Modelling has been undertaken and further modelling will take place to include wave overtopping
- Will liaise with PA prior to submission of application

Further ABP comments:

- Address matters raised in PA Opinion with regards to this matter
- Ensure that there are no conflicting or outstanding issues
- There is no provision for Further Information at application stage

8. Any other matters**Planning Authority's comments:**

- Queried if access to the north beach is being kept; show this in application documentation

Prospective Applicant's response:

- Existing access to the north beach is being maintained

Further ABP comments:

- Submit a building lifecycle report; schedule of floor areas; CGIs/visualisations/cross section; waste management details

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
Assistant Director of Planning
June, 2020