



Case Reference / Description	122 no. residential units (102 no. houses, 20 no. apartments) and associated site works. Ballinalea, Ashford, Co. Wicklow.		
Case Type	Section 5 Pre-Application Consultation Request		
Date:	1 st December 2020	Start Time	14:41 p.m.
Location	Via Microsoft Teams	End Time	15:45 p.m.
Chairperson	Stephen O' Sullivan	Executive Officer	Ciaran Hand

Representing An Bord Pleanála:

Stephen O' Sullivan, Assistant Director of Planning
Elaine Power, Planning Inspector
Ciaran Hand, Executive Officer

Representing Prospective Applicant:

Trevor Sadler, McGill Planning
Caitlin Marley, McGill Planning
Shane Walsh, MCORM
Paul Keane, MCORM
John Montgomery, NMP
Paul Casey, Punch
Sean O'Neill, Client
Shane McBride, Client
Noreen McLoughlin, Whitehill Environmental

Representing Planning Authority

Fergal Keogh, Senior Engineer

Edel Bermingham, Senior Executive Planner
Brian O'Sullivan, Assistant Engineer
Kevin Scanlon, District Engineer

Introduction

The representatives of An Bord Pleanála (ABP) welcomed the prospective applicant, Planning Authority (PA) 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 PA on 22nd October 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 25th September 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. Development Strategy – Objective AA1 of the Ashford Local Area Plan; density; design and layout; open space; housing mix.**
- 2. Access Arrangements – Objective AA1 of the Ashford Local Area Plan.**
- 3. Car Parking Strategy**
- 4. Water Services – wastewater and flood risk**
- 5. Childcare Provision**
- 6. Ecology and Appropriate Assessment**
- 7. Any Other Matters.**

1. Development Strategy – Objective AA1 of the Ashford Local Area Plan; density; design and layout; open space; housing mix.

• ABP Comments:

- Outline compliance with Objective AA1 of the LAP.
- Clarify how the proposed development supports the overall objectives for these lands, taking account of lands outside of the applicants ownership, to the north and south.
- Clarify the land ownership of AA1 lands.
- Provide a rationale for the proposed density which is above that set out in the LAP.
- Any proposed material contravention of the LAP must be clearly stated in the Material Contravention Statement submitted with the application.
- Examine potential for dual fronted duplex units to provide passive overlooking of the open space to the rear of the duplex units.
- Provide a rationale for the provision of open space 3, located in the north west
- Justify the proposed housing mix proposed.

• Prospective Applicant's Comments:

- The site is at the centre of the AA1 lands
- There are different landholdings and ownership issues
- The proposed development would not prejudice the north and south landholdings and a masterplan for the lands has been submitted.
- Site can connect directly to the R772 as envisioned in the LAP, as lands to the north of the site are in separate ownership.
- The layout has been designed to allow for future permeability and connectivity to adjoining sites.
- The layout of the scheme ensures that long roads are avoid. There can be further consideration of homezones. Corner units can be reconsidered, with more articulation, dual frontage and more passive overlooking
- The site entrance can be re-examined to ensure the development has no negative impact on the existing residential and visual amenities.
- Duplexes will have overlooking and surveillance from the first floor
- Housing mix is appropriate for the area
- A social infrastructure audit will be submitted to ensure there are sufficient facilities in Ashford to cater for the development.

• Planning Authority's Comments:

- Outline how the development would not compromise the overall action area plan
- Density is not meeting the LAP and would impact on the overall number of units proposed for the AA1 lands.
- Dual fronted duplex units could impact on the development potential of adjoining lands
- The provision of communal space to the rear of the duplex units would eliminate potential any social behaviour.
- The layout of open space 3 should be reconsidered to ensure adequate overlooking. A turning area is still required in the north west corner of the site to allow for vehicular movements.

- The design and elevational treatments of the units could be re-examined

2. Access Arrangements – Objective AA1 of the Ashford Local Area Plan.

- **ABP Comments:**

- Justify the proposed access route through an established estate residential estate and not via the R772 to the north of the site.
- Address any potential issues with the junctions

- **Prospective Applicant's Comments:**

- Due to landownership issues it is not possible to provide access via the R772.
- There is adequate capacity within the surrounding road network, however, a quality audit showing safety for cycle, walking and driving would be submitted
- The site is providing permeability and allows for future connections

Planning Authority's Comments:

- There is an established development of c.200 units using the same access road
- All junctions on the approach to the development from the R772 should be accessed to ensure their adequacy to accommodate the additional movements.
- Ensure compliance with DMURS

3. Car Parking Strategy

- **ABP Comments:**

- Justify the proposed number of car parking spaces.
- Have regard to car parking for the duplex units being relocated to the rear of the units to allow for an improved public realm.

- **Prospective Applicant's Comments:**

- There is a bus service in the area
- Car parking is considered adequate for the development and the quantum will be justified
- Parking at the front of the duplex is limited and would slow the road speed
- There is not enough space at the rear of the duplex units to accommodate car parking.

- **Planning Authority's Comments:**

- Justify the number and layout of car parking spaces within the scheme.

4. Water Services – wastewater and flood risk

- **ABP Comments:**

- There is an existing cast iron water pipe located beneath the site that would be required to be relocated to facilitate the scheme.
- The capacity of the foul pumping station should accommodate future development lands
- Flood risk potential from the pumping station.
- **Prospective Applicant's Comments:**
 - A diversion is required for the pipe removal and the applicant is aware of the requirement to remove the infrastructure.
 - The development would connect to the public water infrastructure, located to the west of the site under the public road. There is no required to access through third party lands.
 - With regard to the capacity of the pumping station. The lands to the north of the site can connect via a gravity connection to the public network under the R772.
 - The lands to the south would not discharge via gravity. A single pumping station for the subject site and the lands to the south could be provide. Foul sewage would be pumped to the public network located to the east of the site.
 - Proposed development is on flood zone C. A site specific flood risk assessment will be provided
- **Planning Authority's Comments:**
 - Show that lands to the north can be drained via gravity
 - Ensure that Irish Water can confirm that the foul network can be taken in charge
 - Outline the design and location of the pumping station
 - Pumping station should be near open space

5. Childcare Provision

- **ABP Comments:**
 - Justify why no childcare facility is being proposed having regard to the housing mix proposed and the capacity of existing facilities in Ashford.
- **Prospective Applicant's Comments:**
 - Surrounding area has 5 existing childcare facilities and 1 permitted
- **Planning Authority's Comments:**
 - There should be a childcare facility at this location
 - Consult with Wicklow Childcare Committee

6. Ecology and Appropriate Assessment

- **ABP Comments:**
 - Clarify the impact of the proposed development on ecology within the site and detail any mitigation measures proposed.

- If a Natura Impact Statement is provided ensure that it fully addresses the impacts on the qualifying interests and details the proposed mitigation measures, if any.
- Justify the removal of the hedgerow in the centre of the site. Having regard to development plan policy.
- Mature trees should be retained where possible
- **Prospective Applicant's Comments:**
 - Site is hydrologically connected to the designated sites
 - An NIS would be submitted as mitigation measures are proposed to protect the stream, along the southern boundary of the site.
 - The biodiversity on the hedgerow is not high
 - There is no impact on mature trees
- **Planning Authority's Comments:**
 - Look to compensate for the hedgerow removal
 - The landscape design could incorporate extra biodiversity
 - There are no notable bat roosts on site

7. Any Other Matters.

- **ABP Comments with regard to application:**
 - No further comments
- **Prospective Applicant's Comments:**
 - No further comments
- **Planning Authority's Comments:**
 - Submit a social infrastructure audit and consideration of a financial contribution in lieu of required infrastructure.

- **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

Stephen O' Sullivan
Assistant Director of Planning
, 2020