



**An
Bord
Pleanála**

Record of Meeting ABP-307438-20

Case Reference / Description	Demolition of structures, construction of 246 no. residential units (112 no. houses, 134 no. apartments), childcare facility and associated site works. Lands to the north of the R125 in the townlands of Dolandstown and Newtownmoyaghy, Kilcock, Co. Meath.		
Case Type	Section 5 Pre-Application Consultation Request		
Date:	2 nd October 2020	Start Time	09:35
Location	Via Microsoft Teams	End Time	11:20
Chairperson	Tom Rabbette	Executive Officer	Ciaran Hand

Representing An Bord Pleanála:

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

Representing Prospective Applicant:

Claire McManus, Architect, JFOC
Dominic Stevens, Architect, JFOC
Brendan Keogh, DBFL Consulting Engineers
Ronan Mac Diarmada, Landscape Architect
Tom Bailey, Project Manager
Declan Brassil, Planner

Representing Planning Authority

Billy Joe Padden, A/SEP
David Keyes, SEE, Environment
Joe Mc Garvey, SEE, Transport
Paul Aspell, AE, Water Services

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 24th July 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 29th June 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 (including zoning/phasing/core strategy/density)**
- 2. Transport including parking provision/required pedestrian and cycle infrastructure upgrades/roads proposals/permeability**
- 3. Design and Layout/Residential Standards/Open Space Strategy**
- 4. Flood Risk/Site Services (including surface water/foul/water supply)**
- 5. Social Infrastructure (including childcare/school provision)**
- 6. Environmental Screening**
- 7. Any other matters**

1. Principle (including zoning/phasing/core strategy/density)

ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:

- Principle of development
- Core strategy and density
- Proposed amendments to the zoning of the site in the Draft Development Plan.
- Timescale for adoption of Draft Development Plan.

Planning Authority's comments:

- Draft plan is due to be adopted April 2021.
- Lands are in phase 2 and zoning is being retained.

Prospective Applicant's response:

- Nothing is being dezoned
- Areas of potential flooding will be outlined in an updated RPS report on flooding issues.
- The net site area is on lands zoned in flood zone C.
- Principle of development will be justified in application documents.

Further ABP comments:

- Submit a rationale for why this site is suitable for development
- Show how this site sits in the wider Kilcock area
- Submit a phasing plan.
- If materially contravening a plan, applicant needs to be clear in relation to what policies or objectives are being contravened
- Clarification needed in relation to the potential of lands to be dezoned in the Draft Plan.

2. Transport including parking provision/required pedestrian and cycle infrastructure upgrades/roads proposals/permeability

ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:

- Car parking provision
- Linkages – footpaths
- Pedestrian and cyclist connections including proposed connections over the Meath Bridge and on the R125.
- Delivery of infrastructure/link road.

Planning Authority's response:

- Car parking is 0.75 spaces per unit
- There is a high demand for car parking
- Prefer one car space per unit
- Submit a road safety audit
- Consultations should take place with Kildare County Council regarding design of the connection over the Meath Bridge.

- This is the only pedestrian and cyclist access points to the town that is considered safe and is a critical link
- Applicant is required to clarify when road upgrades will be complete
- Development must be phased appropriately.
- The design of the distributor road is generally in line with DMURS
- Need to agree the design prior to commencement
- Support a footpath provision for the R125 Road to the north and east of the site.
- Detail treatment for road frontage

Prospective Applicant's response:

- Northern end of the site has two spaces per unit
- Apartments have one space per unit
- There is 10% visitor parking
- Southern end of the site contains 0.75 spaces per unit/This is 250 metres to Kilcock town centre
- Car parking figure of 0.75 spaces per unit is in line with the guidelines.
- A number of different landowners will deliver the infrastructure.
- A network of walkways will enable connectivity to Meath Bridge.
- Attempting to integrate the development towards Meath Bridge
- Upgrades to the Meath Bridge have been conditioned in a previous permission in conjunction with Kildare and Meath County Councils.
- It could be conditioned again in the future.
- Each landowner has included the main road in their red line boundary.
- The development will allow for the delivery of key infrastructure into the town.
- Three regional roads can be connected.
- Main pedestrian links are focused on Meath Bridge.
- Access to houses will be via the main distributor road.
- Envisage cyclists going through the park land
- The road to the north would not be seen as the main access point to houses.
- The native hedgerow is being maintained along with habitat renewal
- The R125 road does not have a cycle lane.

Further ABP comments:

- Justify the car parking provision.
- Show pedestrian links back into Kilcock town
- Set out who is delivering the Meath Bridge upgrades, what the upgrades entail and when it will be delivered
- Additional Photomontages would be beneficial.

3. Design and Layout/Residential Standards/Open Space Strategy

ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:

- Block B Height and Location
- Proposed split level for block A
- Lower ground floor aspect of Block A
- Rational for the side access to house type A/Design and appearance of same.

Planning Authority's response:

- Outline if there is any impact of block B on the Protected Structure
- More analysis is needed
- The proposed height is acceptable
- Locked in parking (House Type A) is undesirable
- Proposed perpendicular parking should have a six-metre width
- Emergency access located on the south eastern corner will be difficult to access
- Have regard to the turning movement and maintenance

Prospective Applicant's response:

- Block B justification will be outlined
- The split level for block A is due to the different change in levels on the site
- The change in levels allows for a taller elevation
- Site falls from east to west
- The lower ground floor units are facing south west
- There are two fronts and a change in levels in the building
- Four levels are facing the road
- Three levels are facing the main street
- One unit per block is single aspect
- Sunlight and daylight analysis including impacts of balconies will be detailed
- House type A works with parking at the side and not the front
- Entering the houses at the side allows for a more efficient layout
- The street is defined by building and not car parking
- Streets are lined with planting and trees
- The location of the emergency access will be examined

Further ABP comments:

- Justify the height and location of Block B
- Have regard to the protected structure in close proximity
- More CGI's should be submitted
- Address sunlight and daylight impact of balconies i.e. ground floor units of Block B
- Show more images and photomontages for house type A
- Justify the house type

4. Flood Risk/Site Services (including surface water/foul/water supply)

ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:

- Flood zone area
- Potential flooding issues
- Surface water and SUD's measures

Planning Authority's response:

- CFRAMS should show the worst-case scenario
- Pre and post development scenarios are needed
- Flood zones need to be detailed
- Provide an analysis of culvert blockages.

Prospective Applicant's response:

- The RPS report outcome will update the flows and levels of flood zones A and B
- Working with CFRAMS and the RPS report
- A surface water strategy will be provided
- In relation to foul water, there is a connection at the junction
- The proposal is to extend the foul sewer along the proposed link street

Further ABP comments:

- Some units appear to be in the flood zone area
- There is no further information sought at application stage

5. Social Infrastructure (including childcare/school provision)

ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:

- School capacity

Planning Authority's response:

- A robust childcare assessment is required

Prospective Applicant's response:

- An assessment will be included

Further ABP comments:

- Submit an audit regarding school capacity

6. Environmental screening

ABP sought further elaboration/discussion on:

- Environmental screening

Planning Authority's response:

- It would be welcome if the applicant has discussions with the NPWS

Prospective Applicant's response:

- Environmental screening will be undertaken

7. AOB

Planning Authority's comments:

- In relation to the Part V show the number of houses and apartments

Prospective Applicant's response:

- No further comments

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

October, 2020

