



An  
Bord  
Pleanála

## Record of Meeting ABP-306878-20

<b>Case Reference / Description</b>	357 no. residential units (169 no. houses, 188 no. apartments), childcare facilities and associated site works. Colp West, Drogheda, Co. Meath.		
<b>Case Type</b>	Section 5 Pre-Application Consultation Request		
<b>Date:</b>	25 <sup>th</sup> May 2020	<b>Start Time</b>	10:00 a.m.
<b>Location</b>	Via Microsoft Teams	<b>End Time</b>	10:45 a.m.
<b>Chairperson</b>	Tom Rabbette	<b>Executive Officer</b>	Ciaran Hand

### Representing An Bord Pleanála:

Tom Rabbette, Assistant Director of Planning
Stephen Rhys Thomas, Senior Planning Inspector
Ciaran Hand, Executive Officer

### Representing Prospective Applicant:

Brian Hughes, Brady Hughes
Paul Duignan, DDA Architects
Jim Dowdall, EnviroGuide
Deirdre Walsh, DBFL Consulting Engineers
John Spain, JSA
Luke Wymer, JSA

### Representing Planning Authority

Billy Joe Padden, A/Senior Executive Planner
Joe McGarvey, 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 5<sup>th</sup> May 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 13<sup>th</sup> 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. Natural Heritage. Address reason for refusal.**
- 2. Pedestrian permeability and DMURS**
- 3. Any other matters.**

## **1. Natural Heritage, Address reason for refusal**

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

- Natural heritage and the reason for the previous refusal on SHD app. ref. 305703

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

- Surveys presented at the section 247 meeting covered four days of observations
- A twelve-day survey would be comprehensive
- Update the relevant chapter in the EIAR

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

- The NIS on the previously refused application related to the SAC and not the SPA
- A survey has been undertaken between 20<sup>th</sup> February and 3<sup>rd</sup> April
- The result shows that this site is not an ex-situ feeding site
- No species have been recorded
- Surveys were undertaken for twelve days from dawn to dusk, this includes changes in the tide
- In relation to a NIS there are no significant effects, the only change is more detail within the screening report to take account of possible ex-situ feeding grounds.

### **Further ABP comments:**

- Address the reason for refusal on the previous application
- Ensure that all documents (NIS, EIAR and others) are up-to-date and contain no conflicts

## **2. Pedestrian permeability and DMURS**

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

- Landscaping treatment around the bridge over the railway
- If there has been consultations with Irish Rail
- Proposed road widths throughout the scheme, are they DMURS compliant, could they be narrower?

### **Planning Authority's response:**

- Satisfied that there is passive supervision around the bridge area from housing
- A DMURS quality audit should outline pedestrian and cycle access to the bridge
- Long straights are a concern but here should be a self-regulating 30km limit as chicanes and deflections are incorporated
- A road width of 5.5 metres is a minimum

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

- A letter of consent from Irish Rail has been received
- Bridge is at a high level and sits on pillars, this has taken the least amount of space from landscaping around the bridge
- There is passive supervision and capacity for planting
- Tree loss impact will be minimised along the southside of the bridge and more landscaping will be detailed
- Road width of 6.5 metres allows for bus access to the school

- The road to the western site is 5.5 metres with a 2 metre footpath. There will be pedestrian priority crossing points and horizontal deflections
- Pedestrian desire lines and raised crossings will be detailed and a quality audit will be submitted
- Provision has been made to access the school site

**Further ABP comments:**

- Detail the level of landscaping and the design of the bridge in its entirety
- Ensure pedestrian and cyclist permeability
- Have regard to DMURS standards in the design of streets within the scheme

**3. Any other matters**

**Planning Authority's comments:**

- Irish Water submission outlines a slight change in circumstances
- Surface water outfall is to be increased
- Address any issues in our report and any outstanding issues with Irish water

**Prospective Applicant's response:**

- Outfall can be addressed

**Further ABP comments:**

- Have regard to the Irish Water submission and any change in circumstances, further engagement is encouraged
- Look at submissions on the previously refused application, particularly the NTA and department of education submissions

**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](mailto: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](mailto:spatialplanning@water.ie)

---

Tom Rabbette  
Assistant Director of Planning  
June, 2020