



An
Bord
Pleanála

Record of Meeting ABP-307089-20

Case Reference / Description	164 no. residential units (104 no. houses, 60 no. apartments), creche and associated works. Cookstown, Cookstown Road, Enniskerry, Co. Wicklow.		
Case Type	Section 5 Pre-Application Consultation Request		
Date:	3 rd July 2020	Start Time	09:35 a.m.
Location	Via Microsoft Teams	End Time	11:30 a.m.
Chairperson	Tom Rabbette	Executive Officer	Ciaran Hand

Representing An Bord Pleanála:

Tom Rabbette, Assistant Director of Planning
Ronan O'Connor, Senior Planning Inspector
Conor McGrath, Senior Planning Inspector
Ciaran Hand, Executive Officer

Representing Prospective Applicant:

Emma Flanagan, Cairn Homes
John Grace, Cairn Homes
Daibhi MacDomhnaill, Cairn Homes
Naomi Lloyd, Architects
Thomas MacHale, Engineer
Peter O'Dwyer, Engineer
John Spain, John Spain Associates
Rory Kunz, John Spain Associates

Representing Planning Authority

Fergal Keogh, Senior Engineer
Lucy Roche, Executive Planner
Brian O'Sullivan, Assistant 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 25th 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 21st April 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. Principle of Development (incl zoning/Action Area Plan 3 Criteria)**
- 2. Design (incl. layout/site topography/impact on views/units types etc)**
- 3. Residential Standards/Residential Amenity**
- 4. Transport including compliance with DMURS/required upgrades/permeability**
- 5. Trees/Ecology/Ecological Screening**
- 6. Site services**
- 7. Any Other Matters**

1. Principle of Development (including zoning/Action Area Plan 3 Criteria)

ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:

- Compliance with Action Area Plan criteria.

Planning Authority's comments:

- Action Area Plan 3 criteria apply
- The LAP objective states that 0.4 HA should be used to provide sheltered housing
- The creche should be provided on zoned residential land
- The CE Zoning is being contravened as a creche is not permitted

Prospective Applicant's response:

- There is Part V and sheltered accommodation being provided
- Part V mix includes 16 duplex units and 4 maisonettes
- Creche is in accordance with the CE zoning.
- Therefore, there is no contravention of the CE zoning.

Further ABP comments:

- Outline Part V proposals
- Clarify compliance or otherwise with LAP objectives
- Statement required if applicant considers the proposal to be a material contravention.

2. Design (including layout/site topography/impact on views/units types etc)

ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:

- Proposed layout
- DMURS and topography
- Interface of the development with the Cookstown Road
- Level changes
- Potential impact on the protected view of the Sugar Loaf

Planning Authority's response:

- Satisfied with the layout
- Units should be facing the road
- Outline public open space
- The layout allows for a green corridor
- Detail the green corridor
- The proposed spine road will increase speed
- Examine deflections and comply with DMURS
- Addition of bungalows would be welcome
- Quantum of open space is good
- Detail the quantum of open space

Prospective Applicant's response:

- Ground floor units are being provided instead of bungalows
- Open space will be further developed
- Duplex A & B will have dedicated open space on both sides
- They are dual frontage with access from the northern end

- The ground floor is entered from the south
- Open space will be enlarged at blocks C & D
- Interfaces will be addressed
- Site sections/elevations showing the elevation of lands will be submitted
- Open spaces are usable
- There are level differences
- The levels of the blocks and lands will be reduced
- Distance is 11 meters from the ground floor to the boundary
- 15 meters from the 1st floor to the boundary

Further ABP comments:

- Clarify the open space at Block A
- Ensure standards for amenity spaces are met
- Detail the open spaces, topography and levels
- Submit cross sections and CGI's
- Show the views up/down the Cookstown Road
- Detail any impacts on the protected view of the Sugar Loaf

3. Residential Standards/Residential Amenity

ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:

- Residential amenity impacts including overlooking

Planning Authority's response:

- Show any potential overlooking on adjoining development lands
- Look to providing additional private open space
- There should be 0.64 square meters of open space for 1 square metre of floor area

Prospective Applicant's response:

- Ground floor access at north and south units have larger amenity spaces

Further ABP comments:

- Comply with residential standards
- Outline the residential amenities and any potential impacts
- Have regard to the adjoining permitted development

4. Transport including compliance with DMURS/required upgrades/permeability

ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:

- DMURS compliance
- Proposed road, cycle and pedestrian infrastructure upgrades
- Permeability and connections to adjoining sites
- Existing/future footpath connections
- Links to the proposed public park

Planning Authority's response:

- The internal spine road/cross roads are a concern
- There are conflicting movements in relation to pedestrian safety

- Have regard to potential excess speed
- Ensure sustainable mobility
- Submit long sections outlining what gradients are being used
- Crossing point at the corner is a concern
- Footpath crossing points further to the east could be more suitable
- Any future footpath connection needs to preserve trees

Prospective Applicant's response:

- The internal road is influenced by providing uninterrupted views to the Sugar Loaf mountains
- Home zones are in line with DMURS
- Speeds will be addressed
- There will be dedicated pedestrian crossings
- Gradients and long sections will be provided
- There is a footpath inside the boundary along the southern side (Cookstown Rd.)
- The footpath can be provided inside the boundary with a crossing point
- Footpath to the north east cannot be provided due to 3rd party lands
- Connections will go up to the boundary
- A road safety audit will be submitted
- The public park is interlinked with the neighbouring site
- This is a requirement of the Action Area Plan
- The retaining wall to Cookstown Road is not needed
- There will be a lower and softer boundary on Cookstown Road

Further ABP comments:

- Ensure compliance with DMURS
- Outline permeability
- Show connections to Enniskerry and adjoining sites
- Detail the cycle provision

5. Trees/Ecology/Ecological Screening

ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:

- Trees on the northern boundary
- Ecology and bats

Planning Authority's response:

- Seek to maximise tree retention

Prospective Applicant's response:

- Retained trees will be identified
- Road widening will impact on trees
- Desire to maximise tree retention with new tree planting along the boundary
- Trees on the other boundaries are being retained
- There will be punctuation and limited retention on the western boundary
- In relation to ecology – wider impacts will be assessed
- There is a bat survey
- No bats or roosts are on site

- The site is not of ecological significance

Further ABP comments:

- Outline tree retention
- Have regard to wider ecological impacts
- Address any outstanding issues

6. Site Services

ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:

- Foul water and wastewater
- Potential upgrades

Planning Authority's response:

- Minimise the number of pumping stations if a gravity solution does not exist
- The pumping station in the Enniskerry domain is private
- The proposed pumping station needs a catchment area
- Explain why the site has been chosen
- There is a history of flooding
- Address the issue of flooding
- Explore a gravity system
- Examine culverts and outline if upgrades are required
- Submit a statement on the long-term maintenance of wastewater infrastructure

Prospective Applicant's response:

- The foul sewer drains by gravity and discharges at the R760
- The piping in the village has maintenance and not capacity issues
- Surface water is draining by gravity
- Soak way is designed for a 1 in 100-year storm
- Infiltration trenches will be examined
- Foul pumping is underground via a tank
- There will be future proofing of wastewater infrastructure

Further ABP comments:

- Detail any underground pumping
- Outline any potential noise and vibration
- Submit a site-specific flood risk assessment

7. Any Other Matters

Planning Authority's comments:

- No further comments

Prospective Applicant's response:

- Details regarding garden pods and future adaptability will be submitted at application stage

Further ABP comments:

- No further comments

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
September, 2020