



**An
Bord
Pleanála**

Record of Meeting ABP-307214-20

| | | | |
|-------------------------------------|---|--------------------------|---------------|
| Case Reference / Description | 265 no. residential units (174 no. houses, 91 no. apartments), childcare facility and associated site works. Site to the South and East of the R148 and abutting the Junction 8 roundabout of the M4, Boycetown, Kilcock, Co. Kildare. | | |
| Case Type | Section 5 Pre-Application Consultation Request | | |
| Date: | 23 rd September 2020 | Start Time | 09:30 am |
| Location | Via Microsoft Teams | End Time | 10:50 am |
| Chairperson | Tom Rabbette | Executive Officer | Hannah Cullen |

Representing An Bord Pleanála:

| |
|--|
| Karen Hamilton, Senior Planning Inspector |
| Tom Rabbette, Assistant Director of Planning |
| Hannah Cullen, Executive Officer |

Representing Prospective Applicant:

| |
|------------------------------------|
| David Mulcahy, Planning Consultant |
| Seamus Savage, Project Manager |
| Paul Byrne, Paul Byrne Architects |
| Owen Sullivan, CS Consulting Group |

Representing Planning Authority

| |
|---|
| Eoghan Lynch, Senior Executive Planner |
| Amy Granville, Senior Executive Planner |
| Sandra McCormack, Assistant Planner |
| George Willoughby, Road Department |
| David Hall, Water Services |
| Lynda Behan, Housing Department |

Introduction

The representatives of An Bord Pleanála (ABP) welcomed the prospective applicant, Planning Authority (PA) via Microsoft Teams having regard to the Covid-19 virus.

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 24th June, 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 22nd May, 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. Core Strategy, inter alia, Variation No. 1 of the Kildare County Development Plan 2017-2023.**
- 2. Traffic and Transport, inter alia, proposed spine road, access onto the R158 and DMURS compliance.**
- 3. Development Strategy, inter alia, urban design, open space, building design, phasing, density and location adjoining a protected structure.**
- 4. Water, Waste water and surface water, inter alia, Irish Water and Planning Authority.**
- 5. Any Other Matters.**

1. Core Strategy, inter alia, Variation No. 1 of the Kildare County Development Plan 2017-2023.

ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:

- Consideration for variation No. 1 of the Kildare County Development Plan 2017-2023 which has been adopted.
- Material contravention of the development plan?

PA Comments:

- Variation of the Kildare County Development Plan was adopted in June however came into effect immediately.
- Zonings will be revaluated as part of the new county development plan.

Prospective Applicants comments:

- Over the population allocation figure, therefore a Material Contravention will be included.
- Lands currently zoned for residential uses.
- A statement of material contravention and justification for the proposal will be submitted.

Further ABP comments:

- Material Contravention will need to be highlighted at application stage.

2. Traffic and Transport, inter alia, proposed spine road, access onto the R158 and DMURS compliance.

ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:

- SHD permission adjoining the site included a condition requiring the full design and standards of the road to be agreed with PA prior to construction.
- MT025 onto the R148/M4 interchange- cognisant of the submission from NTA and TII
- Design standards to NRA Design Manual for Roads will need to be complied with.
- DMURS compliance hierarchy and design of roads.
- Royal canal pedestrian cycle link applicable on this site?
- Proposed roundabout would have to be included in the red line boundary if deemed necessary for the proposal.
- Proliferation of cul-de-sac's not desirable option.
- National Cycle Compliance.

PA Comments:

- Key issue with the spine road continuity in design.
- Footpath width and cycle paths are to be 2 meters.
- If lights are proposed at the junction there is a concern this will create a build-up of traffic.
- There has been engagement between the planning authority and the prospective applicant and further discussion welcome.
- Avoidance of the use of straight roads.
- Traffic and Transport assessment is to be carried out for application stage.
- Noise from the motorway interchange is to be considered, a robust analysis should be provided.

- The Royal Canal pedestrian/ cycle link is not within the site
- From units 43-60 a road adjacent and parallel another road appears to serve these units, this needs to be further considered.
- Has there been provision of a controlled access for vehicles onto the spine road?
- Consideration for crossing facilities and bus stops (recess stops in particular) along the spine road.
- Car parking Schedule for proposal,
- Appropriateness of parking along the Link road.

Prospective Applicants comments:

- All design comments/feedback will be taken on board.
- Main spine road will be minimum of 6 ½ meters wide.
- Design has regard to objective of MT025.
- A road safety audit will be carried out and submitted with the application
- Idea was to resist a signalised junction at the spine road, possibility of a right-hand turning lane.
- Future provision for a roundabout, however not reliant on this.
- There will be a controlled access for vehicles.

Further ABP comments:

- Further consideration to be given in relation to DMURS, permeability and connectivity in and out of the site.
- There are parallel roads within the design which would not appear to be DMURS compliant.

Further PA comments:

- At application stage if a colour coded parking provision document could be provided for clarity.
- Some sort of level of design should be carried out in relation to the roundabout and submitted at application stage.

Further Applicant's comments:

- Applicant will look at the cul-de-sacs in further detail.
- Further meetings to be held with the planning authority.

3. Development Strategy, inter alia, urban design, open space, building design, phasing, density and location adjoining a protected structure.

ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:

- Density currently resting at 31 per hectare minus the link road and open space, may not be compliant with the national guidance, 35-50 per hectare Section 5 of the Sustainable Residential Guidelines for outer suburban / greenfield noted.
- Use of higher features to provide place making
- Adjoining SHD application had 45 units per ha.
- Functionality of the open spaces.

- Justification for density having regard to Kilcock as a town within the MASP on a train line with the commuter service.

PA Comments:

- Due to the outward extremity of site the PA would be reluctant to encourage a higher density than what has already been proposed.
- In relation to the area of open space located in the southern most area, design/layout could be reconsidered, give more consideration to the adjoining potential development.
- A number of proposed units siding onto areas of open space.
- Provision of parking between the open space and the proposed units.
- Use of the space located to the rear of the protected structure.
- Unit's 13-15 prominence of rear garden boundaries.
- Terraces appear extremely exposed in E units.
- Further consideration for living room widths, bicycle storage near entrance/exit and bin storage.
- Only 5 out of 174 dwellings appear to have been proposed for Part V units, would require more.
- Part V dwellings, consider further details such as own door access.
- Screening options to be explored between footpaths and parking.
- 2 clusters of 5 units located together, scope to rethink and provide alternate option for integration throughout the scheme.
- Treatment along the R148 (north) - important to encourage permeability and define streets
- Layout from the indicative masterplan

Prospective Applicant's comments:

- In agreement with the planning authority in relation to density.
- The adjoining SHD was at 44 units per ha and included road, not open space although this was outside the normal requirement for 15%.
- Layout chosen has been part of many discussions and modified many times for the best possible solution.
- Most areas of open space are overlooked by housing on all sides.
- Protected structure will be treated in a respectful manner in accordance with the scheme with respect to landscaping which will help to reinforce its appearance.
- Existing hedgerows assist in bringing the adjoining space to a satisfactory conclusion between developments.
- Advice given in relation to Part V units was $\frac{1}{3}$ 1 bed, $\frac{1}{3}$ 2 bed and $\frac{1}{3}$ 3 bed units from previous meeting with the planning authority, this is an initial proposal, can be relooked at.
- Clarification from the planning authority needed in relation to set back distance from the motorway or interchange of 91 meters.

Further ABP comments:

- Compliance with, inter alia, national policy documents regarding height and sense of place, previous Board decision can be looked at.

- Agreement between the planning authority and prospective applicant in relation to Part V allocation.
- Sustainable residential guidelines provide guidance on integration of features in co-ordination with the efficient use of lands.

Further PA comments:

- At units 43-60 - the placement of 'road within a road' (parallel roads), needs to be considered
- Set back from the interchange to be taken into consideration increase of buffer zone, noise assessment results will help to provide more insight.

4. Water, Waste water and surface water, inter alia, Irish Water and Planning Authority.

ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:

- Comments on submission received from Irish water.
- Upgrade to start 2023 and completed 2025- Phasing should be linked to the delivery of infrastructure and agreed prior to submission of any application.

PA Comments:

- Refer to issues raised in Water Services Stage 2 Report.
- Water supply connections through third party lands
- Surface water information is indicative and preliminary in nature.
- Surface water design principles.
- Ground water monitoring programme.
- Numerous water courses and drainage channels to be considered and the treatment around the site and site boundaries.

Prospective Applicant's comments:

- Meeting with Irish Water in relation to pump station no. 13, use this to cater for undeveloped lands west of the site, can add on if they see fit to address local deficiencies in the area.
- The proposal includes connecting to the water supply in the adjoining SHD and not the Ring Main as mentioned in IW submission.

Further PA comments:

- Recommended due to the level of ongoing development in the area of the lands an assessment of existing networks and Lower Liffey Valley catchment by Irish Water to identify availability /capacity and any constraints in the network
- Further meetings are welcomed with the applicant to discuss technical issues/details.
- Site specific flood risk assessment to be provided with lodgement of an application.

Further Applicant's comments:

- Happy to liaise further with the planning authority.
- Requested documentation will be provided when an application is being submitted.

5. Any other matters

ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:

- School capacity.
- Phasing to be considered in relation to crèche provision.

PA Comments:

- Crèche design for the proposed development, quality is highly important due to the location at the entry point to the site.

Prospective Applicants comments:

- Nothing further to add, all comments are noted.

Conclusion

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
October, 2020

16

